

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XVII

MAY, 1946

No. 5

The Missouri Synod and English Work

By H. B. HEMMETER

(Written at the Request of Synod's Centennial Committee)

The Missouri Synod, which is about to celebrate its centennial in 1947, has been known in the past largely as a German-speaking body. Its interest and its activity in Lutheran church work in the English language are not so generally known or understood. The fact is that both the Saxon and the Franconian founders from the very beginning were interested in, and anxious to do, service in the language of their new homeland. Already before the organization of Synod in 1847 the Saxons in 1838 established their Concordia Academy in Altenburg, Missouri, enrolling at the very start one who was preparing to preach the Gospel in the English language and another to preach to the Indians. The Franconian fathers almost simultaneously with their German work began their mission among the Indians. Moreover, one of the very founders of Synod, Pastor Brohm, is known to have preached in English to the English-speaking people in Perry County, Missouri, in Synod's earliest days.

The question then arises as to how it came about that the Missouri Synod during the first fifty years of its existence engaged so predominantly in German work. The answer, of course, lies clearly on the surface for all those who are conversant with the conditions which confronted the Synod at that time. During those years the energies of the body were

pre-empted by the great need for German preaching among the German settlers in the East and West, especially among those who were coming to this country during that time and who settled in the Middle West, the Northwest, and in Canada in continuously growing numbers. It was a matter of doing the work which lay closest at their door and for which the Synod was best fitted.

Their preoccupation and self-exhausting work among the Germans during these first fifty years of Synod's existence did not, however, change Synod's attitude toward English missionary work. There may have been individuals who by reason of local experience or interests, or for other reasons, lacked adequate vision in this matter, just as is generally the case in larger bodies of men on matters of policy. But whatever may have been the reaction of one or the other here and there, Synod as such and its leaders furnish no justification for a claim of lack of interest in the English cause. This fact is evident in Synod's official attitude during the first fifty years of its history toward the then largely English Tennessee Synod. That synod by that time had gone through its transition from German to English and had preserved its conservative confessional character. In spite of Missouri's absorbing work, often quite exhausting, meeting the demands of German people demanding spiritual attention, Dr. C. F. W. Walther, Missouri's great leader, and others with him found time to show their good will and to lend their influence to those staunch contenders for the faith in the great Southeast. Note the following records gleaned from the minutes of the Tennessee Synod as contained in Henkel's *History* of that body. In its 28th session in 1848 that Synod resolved:

"That we rejoice to learn that some of our German Lutheran brethren in the West have formed themselves into a synod, called 'The German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States,' and that they are publishing a German paper, styled *Der Lutheraner*, which is devoted to the promulgation and defense of the primitive doctrines and usages of the Lutheran Church; to which paper we would call the attention of our German brethren." (Henkel's *History*, etc., pp. 119—120.)

In 1853, only a few years after the organization of The Missouri Synod, official relations between Tennessee and Mis-

souri had been established. According to Henkel's *History*, page 137, the records of Tennessee read:

"No. 10 is a letter from Rev. A. Biewend, a member of the Missouri Synod, in which he informs us that he was appointed a delegate to this body, but that, owing to intervening circumstances, he was prevented from attending. He also expresses the hope and desire that a more intimate acquaintance may be formed between these two bodies."

"Your committee would recommend the following for adoption: —

"Resolved, 1. That we duly appreciate the kind regard of the Missouri Synod and that we also desire a more intimate acquaintance with them and that we appoint Rev. J. R. Moser a delegate to the next session of that Synod."

Letters from the Revs. Theo. Brohm and A. Hoyer, both of the Missouri Synod, were received and printed in full in the minutes. Compare Henkel, pp. 139—140.

In 1854 the Tennessee Synod minutes record:

"The Rev. Theodore Brohm of the Missouri Synod being present, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted: —

"WHEREAS, The Rev. Theodore Brohm of the city of New York, delegate of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, has appeared amongst us and we are assured from personal interviews with him as well as from other sources of information that the synod which he represents adheres strictly to the doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as exhibited in her confessional standards and are zealously and actively engaged in promoting the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom; be it therefore

"Resolved, 1. That we are highly gratified to see Brother Brohm in our midst.

"Resolved, 2. That we fully and cheerfully reciprocate the kind and fraternal feelings expressed and manifested towards us by the Missouri Synod.

"Resolved, 3. That we will endeavor to cultivate a more intimate acquaintance and a closer union with the Missouri Synod.

"Resolved, 4. That for this purpose Rev. Socrates Henkel be appointed a delegate from this body to the Eastern division

[District] of the Missouri Synod to be held in Baltimore and that Rev. J. R. Moser be appointed our delegate to the Western division [District] of said synod at its next session." (Henkel's *History*, etc., p. 141.)

The close connection of this fraternal exchange of members of the two synods culminated in the forming of the English Conference of Missouri, in 1872, at which the Revs. Polycarp C. Henkel and Jonathan R. Moser, both Tennessean pastors, were present, joining in with Dr. C. F. W. Walther and the Rev. Ch. S. Kleppisch of Missouri. This Conference in 1889 became the English Synod of Missouri.

Connected with and in harmony with this official relation between Missouri and Tennessee, many printed items in Missouri publications might be recorded. Outstanding among them we find an essay of the Rev. F. W. Foehlinger, printed by resolution of Synod in *Lehre und Wehre* (Vol. XI, No. 8, pp. 236 ff.) in the August number of 1865, *by resolution of Synod*. We may therefore consider this essay as a statement of synodical position. This essay advocates vigorous provision of English preaching within our own circles for the purpose of conserving the spiritual interests of the Anglicizing youth of our Church. The essay treats the matter very extensively, meeting all arguments to the contrary, and so breathes the spirit of the missionary founders of our Synod, following also the principles, laid down by Synod in 1857, to be observed when English congregations are to be organized out of German congregations. Here are parts of the essay reproduced:

THE ESTABLISHING OF EV. LUTHERAN CONGREGATIONS AMONG OUR ENGLISH-SPEAKING DESCENDANTS

I

"Since, if we reason on the basis of former experience, it is very possible that our German descendants will pass over to the English language, therefore it is undoubtedly the sacred duty of the Lutheran Church to give care to this end that the pure doctrine of the Ev. Lutheran Church be preserved in the English language for our descendants."

In this essay reference is made to the experience of the past century, during which thousands of Germans came to this

country, whose descendants became English and so were lost to the pure Word and the Sacraments of the Lutheran Church. So it was with the Swedes in New Jersey. Even those immigrants who came to this country on account of their faith, like the Salzburgers, who under their leaders, learned and faithful preachers, settled in Georgia, were in their descendants estranged from the Lutheran Church because they found no church which had the pure doctrine in the English language. So it will be also with our descendants; and it will be found a vain effort to keep them with the German language.

The argument that the Gospel cannot be preached as powerfully and as fruitfully in the English as in the German language, it is stated, cannot be meant seriously, since the Gospel in the beginning was not preached in the German language. Since, moreover, the Apostles on the first Pentecost proclaimed the wonderful works of God in divers tongues, which they had not before learned in the ordinary human ways, thereby the Lord has indicated that He would gather to Himself His Church by means of the Holy Ghost, who Himself has created also the languages and given utterance, out of all tongues and nations by means of the Gospel, as also the commission of the Lord to His disciples in Matt. 28:19 states. Moreover, if this claim were true, then one might also draw the conclusion that since the Holy Ghost on the first Pentecost did not preach in the German language, consequently also the Gospel could not be preached as well in the German language as, for instance, in the Greek language. However, this conclusion does not hold.

Then the essayist cites quotations from Luther, which are ever worthy of repeating. From Walch, X, 270: "I do not at all hold with those who devote themselves completely to one language and look down upon all others. For I would like to raise such youth and people who also in foreign lands might be useful to Christ and converse with the people; so that it may not be with us as it was with the Waldensians in Bohemia, who have bound their faith so much into their own language. The Holy Spirit did not do thus in the beginning, He did not wait until all the world should come to Jerusalem and had learnt to know Hebrew, but He gave all tongues to the office of preaching, so that the Apostles were able to speak

wherever they went. This example I will rather follow, that one exercise the youth in many tongues: who knows how God in time may use them. For this purpose also the schools are established."

Again: in Luther's commentary on Genesis, W., I 1042:

"When we therefore look through the history of all nations and times, then we find that from this dissimilarity and variety of languages many kinds of revolutions, wars, and changes in the customs and in religion have risen, and in addition thereto manifold ideas and notions. Therefore God by means of a new miracle desired to turn aside and to do away with such great plague and calamity."

Then the essay continues:

II

"For the accomplishing of this aim, the preservation of the pure doctrine for the future, it is first of all necessary that the English language be fostered at our theological institutions, with especial diligence under one professor, and that the graduating students become capable to preach in the English language with the necessary facility, and to establish and to defend the pure doctrine of the Lutheran Church over against the numberless heterodox churches and so-called Lutherans of all kinds by means of word and script.

III

"In preparation of this purpose it is certainly proper for the present that those younger preachers who are already conversant with the English language master the language as much as possible, in order to preach according to need to the now oncoming English youth, to give catechetical instruction and so in this way to build them up, so to say, alongside of the mother church, into a pure English Lutheran congregation.

IV

"Of indisputable necessity for the future, then, there is the translation of pure Lutheran literature, the dogmatic and catechetical as well as the recreational, besides Lutheran Church hymns.

V

"Desirable also is the founding of an Ev. Lutheran Church paper in the English language."

The foregoing shows that our fathers were awake to the needs of English preaching. Dr. C. F. W. Walther, at the time the editor of *Lehre und Wehre*, especially was awake by word and deed to further this cause.

Neither were efforts to take care of the need for English preaching within the bounds of the Synod itself lacking during these fifty years. An instance in point only a few years after the organization of Synod, and one that shows additional difficulties to those already named in the foregoing, which attended the forming and maintenance of English work, is on record in the following history of the First Missouri Synod English congregation in Baltimore. "Mrs. S., who understood no German, desired to join her husband's church, Old Saint Paul's, at Baltimore. Pastor Wyneken proceeded to instruct her in English, providing her with a New Testament, the Book of Concord, New Market Edition, and a translation of Meurer's *Life of Luther*, which had just been published in New York. But Wyneken left Baltimore before he could confirm the lady, and so Pastor Gottlieb Schaller, vicar during the vacancy, finished the instruction and confirmed her. Pastor Keyl, *busy with the increasing German work*, was not inclined to further the English. But on April 28, 1854, three members of St. Paul's, Dr. A. F. Haynel, Francis Buehler, and Daniel Dobler, addressed a communication to the congregation, asking whether the time to establish an English Lutheran church had not come and soliciting the co-operation of the German congregation in such an organization. As reasons for their action they urged the loss of many young people to the sects soon after their confirmation. The church council, after three months, in a document dated July 27, 1854, replied negatively. Two other communications to the congregation followed, the latter dated August 1, 1855, signed by the petitioners named above in behalf of the "Society for the Furtherance of English Lutheran Services, U. A. C.," this society having been organized May 16, 1855, at the residence of Dr. Haynel. Besides the persons named, men of such known Lutheran character as Thiemeyer, Einwaechter, Schumacher, and others had become members of this society. The memorials they addressed to Old St. Paul's were voluminous. They addressed also Praeses Wyneken and the Eastern District of the Missouri Synod. They were determined men, and when

they had failed to gain the support of Old St. Paul's, in their last communication to the congregation they had said: "Brethren, if you cannot be of one mind with us, pray grant us the liberty of conscience, and give us your blessing upon our undertaking. We only desire that the precious Gospel of Jesus Christ be preached to our children and their descendants as purely and sincerely as we have received it from our pious church fathers." They also stated: "If you refuse our just prayer, you will have to answer for it to God; we will not recede, for we cannot act against God's Word and our conscience; we will go forward, and our banner is: 'Jehovah Nissi,' Exodus 17: 15."

This last communication was dated August 1, and in November, 1856, three members of Old St. Paul's, Dr. A. F. Haynel, Francis Buehler, and Daniel Dobler, together with John Dobler, who was not a member of Keyl's, organized "Old St. Peter's," and J. Clement Miller, former member of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, but who had taken a special course under Walther at St. Louis, became the pastor. A controversy which arose because of the withdrawal of the organizers from Old St. Paul's was carried on until it was finally adjusted November, 1857, by Dr. Walther and Pastor Schwan, who were appointed by *Synod* and who came to Baltimore for that purpose.

A parish school was established by this English congregation, January, 1858, and Teacher C. W. Miller, then at Philadelphia, took charge of the same. He came to Baltimore in April; but the life of the school was short, for the scattered membership of the congregation, which was small, the want of a church edifice and other suitable buildings, as well as the lack of support from the German church, which at that time counted over 300 voting members, spelled its disaster. Teacher Miller, after three months' hard work, withdrew and accepted a call to St. Charles, Mo.

This misfortune was followed by another. Pastor Miller contracted throat trouble, was compelled to resign, and died at Lebanon, Pa., January 5, 1859, of consumption. The faculty at St. Louis now supplied a vicar for the congregation, Student Jacob Buehler, a Baltimore boy, later pioneer Missouri pastor on the Pacific Coast, at San Francisco, and, later still, President for many years of the California District. The

vacancy continuing for some time, Pastor S. Kleppisch followed Student Buehler, until Rev. Henry Wetzel of Mount Solon, Va., was secured for the pastorate for a short while. After vainly calling a number of men, the congregation finally secured Pastor F. A. Schmidt, then of Olean, N. Y., in 1860, under whose leadership the congregation began to grow. The Civil War, however, came with fury, and on April 21, 1861, the congregation was dispossessed of its meeting place, the soldiers requisitioning it for barracks. For a while the congregation worshiped in two different schoolhouses of Old St. Paul's. But the members suffered much from the war, war prices prevailed, and it soon became difficult to maintain the pastorate. Pastor Schmidt, receiving a call at this time, 1861, to the College at Decorah, accepted it. In 1865 the congregation disbanded.

On the basis of records like the foregoing it is our opinion that Missouri followed a course which was most natural and which was dictated by the conditions surrounding it. The founders of Synod were German, had come to this country on account of their Old Lutheran faith. They preached it first to the Germans. And the demands coming to them from their own countrymen taxed their ability, the crying need for German missionary work among Lutheran settlers, thousands of them very recent immigrants, well nigh exhausted their supplies. The need for English missionary work was not ignored by them. They, especially through their leaders, kept their interest in that work alive, though there always were difficulties in the way, and discouraging experiences, such as in the case of the Baltimore congregation, were not wanting.

Dr. W. Dallmann in his "The English Work of the Missouri Synod" published in *Ebenezer*, page 44, is in substantial agreement with this résumé when he says:

"The German Synod from the earliest days saw the need of English work, and Professor Biewend taught the language at the St. Louis Seminary.

"As early as 1852 Synod at Fort Wayne voted the proceeds of lots at Dayton, Ohio, donated by Mr. Buehler, to the institution at Fort Wayne in order to raise the educational standard also in respect to the English language.

"Prominent English citizens having voiced a desire for

an English college at Fort Wayne, Pastor Husmann and Mr. Piepenbrink were appointed a committee to look into the matter. Next year Synod at Cleveland authorized the committee to proceed, since there was no need of proofs that such an institution was needed for our Synod and the Lutheran Church at large. Experience proves that our children will become English in spite of all efforts to keep them German and that English people can remain true Lutherans. The next year Synod at St. Louis thought the matter so important that, if necessary, even a small capital might be borrowed for the purpose; a general collection was also to be taken.

"The collections did not amount to much. The congregations of the Fort Wayne Conference pledged \$7,000 for a new building to house both the seminary and the academy. The dedication of the same on October 26 was the worthy and inspiring close of the synodical sessions of 1857. Mr. A. Sutermeister, formerly a teacher at an English mathematical institution at Boston, was the first professor at the English Academy at Fort Wayne, which was opened on November 16. Dissension between St. Paul's, Baltimore, and some former members at Baltimore, raised the question: 'What measure is Synod to take when the need for an English church becomes apparent?' Professor Biewend read a paper on the subject, and in the same year Synod declared:

"'We account it our sacred duty to found English churches as soon as it has become manifest that for the organization of a congregation there is a sufficient number of such as understand English better than German. . . . Synod acknowledged it in this case the duty of the mother church not only to consent to the organizing of an English church, but also to aid therein with counsel and deed. Especially also willingly dismiss such older and experienced members as indeed do not need it for their own person, but for their family's sake, partly that the members of families might not be divided between different churches, partly that by such older members the young congregation might be strengthened.'"
(Minutes, 1857, pp. 51—52. See also Synodical Conference Minutes, 1872, p. 18, and 1874, p. 33.)

Again, when in 1872 the Synodical Conference was organized, Dr. C. F. W. Walther preaching the opening sermon in St. John's Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Professor Loy

of the Ohio Synod presented the following theses under the heading: "What Is Our Duty Toward the English-speaking Population of Our Country?":

"*Thesis 5.* Wherever it is possible by this means either to retain as members of the church such people as would otherwise be in danger of joining some other denomination, or to obtain others who would but for this cause be lost to our Church altogether, our ministers ought to preach the Gospel in the English language, until these English-speaking people are able to support a minister of their own; and we ought to make it a point in the education of the students of our seminaries that these, when they are ministers, be able also to preach in the English language.

"*Thesis 6.* As so very much reading is done in our time and in our country, we should certainly be guilty of infidelity to the Church would we not do everything in our power to *familiarize the English-speaking people*, through periodicals and books, *with the treasures of our Church*, and therefore the achievement of this aim must always be considered as our main duty."

During the time of the union of Missouri with Ohio the English work was carried on with the aid of ministers coming chiefly from Ohio, and congregations were established in Missouri congregation areas, which, however, later followed their Ohio pastors into the Ohio Synod. The latter experience accounts for some of the lagging interest on the part of some in subsequent efforts to establish English Missions. Nevertheless the dawn of the second half of the first century of Missouri's history was marked by a determined effort in a number of Missouri's centers, chiefly in the larger cities such as Baltimore, Washington, New York City, Pittsburgh, Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee, St. Paul, Akron, Cleveland, and others.

We think it must be admitted on the basis of the record that Missouri synodically had the vision regarding the importance of English work and that it was largely preoccupation which stood in the way of a larger engagement in the English work itself. No one will venture to claim that this vision was of equal intensity in all or even that there was no lack of proper vision on the part of some who were either purblind or influenced by local conditions or experiences. It was largely due to the latter fact that Dr. Walther, who

himself had so clearly manifested his convictions and his interest, both in theory and in practice, in English work, could say: "God has brought us into this country and without our merit has given us the pure doctrine also for the purpose that we should spread it in the language of our country. But, alas, we did not do what we should have done, and I fear that God will punish us for our negligence and take away from us Germans the great blessings which he bestowed upon us, because we did not do in the English language what we should have done." *Ebenezer*, p. 34.

The second half of the Synod's first century was marked and influenced in 1889 by the organizing of the English Synod of Missouri under the fostering care of the German body. German Missouri at that time was yet very predominantly German, and it was thought best to have the English work kept organically separate from the German, the German body creating a committee to act in an advisory and supporting capacity in connection with the English body. The trend toward the use of the English in our German body then set in apace, so that by the year 1911 sentiment in Synod had developed to such an extent that the English Synod was welcomed into the German body as a District, and Synod then struck the term German from its official title, so that henceforth it has been officially known as the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Since that time the trend toward English has continued until now English is preached in practically all our churches and is also the official language of Synod in its business meetings.

In summing up, then, we distinguish three periods of Missouri's attitude and activity in English. The first followed immediately upon its organization in 1847 and consisted in its activity through its leaders and its Districts, associating itself with the old Tennessee Synod, exchanging delegates and fraternal greetings. During this period Synod already officially, through its official organs, advocated the establishing of English congregations to provide spiritual care for the Anglicizing youth of its congregations. This period found its issue in the organization of the English Conference of Missouri in 1872. The second period is marked by Synod's affiliation in 1872 with the Synod of Ohio, at that time largely English. During this period English congregations were formed in Mis-

souri areas and supplied by pastors from the Ohio Synod Seminary. This period terminated with the defection of Ohio, taking most of the English congregations together with their pastors into the Ohio Synod, with attending discouragement as to English work in the areas thus affected. The third period began with the organizing of the English Synod of Missouri in 1889. During this third, more recent, period, the congregations of the English District have been organized, and most of the German congregations have taken up English preaching either alongside of the German or exclusively. For all practical purposes the Synod of Missouri is now an English-speaking body.

Pittsburgh, Pa. 

The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*

By W. ARNDT

This publication comes to us with the legend on the publisher's jacket: "The most important publication in 1946." At first one may be taken aback by such a strong and apparently daring claim, 1946 having only begun; but a little reflection will lead one to say that here we are not dealing with an exaggeration, such as publishing houses are fond of voicing, but with a truly objective evaluation. A new and at that somewhat official translation of the New Testament—what more important work can there appear in this year of grace?

In a pamphlet entitled *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*, written by members of the revision committee, authoritative information is submitted on the origin and the nature of this new version. It will be recalled that the Authorized Version was revised by a committee consisting of British and American scholars, and that this revision appeared in 1881. The American scholars

* The New Covenant Commonly Called the New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Revised Standard Version. Translated from the Greek, Being the Version Set Forth A.D. 1611, Revised A.D. 1881 and A.D. 1901. Compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1946. Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York. 553 pages 5×7½. Price, \$2.00.

belonging to the committee disagreed in a number of instances with their British colleagues, and they issued their own version in 1901, which came to be known as the American Standard Version. In England the Revised Version did not succeed at all in supplanting the Authorized Version of 1611. In America the developments were somewhat different: The American Standard Version was adopted by many congregations as their authoritative translation of the Scriptures and was widely used in and outside the pulpit. But the wish of the promoters to have it adopted by all Protestant churches of America was not realized. Various factors were responsible for this result. The Authorized Version had so endeared itself to English-speaking people that they did not like to see it dislodged. Sentiment was strongly on the side of the old version. Besides, it could not be denied that the changes which had been introduced often destroyed the rhythm, majesty, and force of the 1611 rendering. An old castle had been modernized, and the outcome was a building which was useful for living purposes, but whose original charm had departed. The American Standard Version was scholarly, accurate, an excellent guide for the student, especially one who was not well versed in the original tongues, because it was quite literal, but its aesthetic qualities were not equal to those of the old translation. The Bible-reading public instinctively clung to the A. V. It was freely acknowledged that the archaisms of this version, the mistranslations found in it, and the progress in the field of textual criticism made a new translation very desirable, but while in these respects the American Standard Version, generally speaking, fulfilled the requirements, there was something lacking in its style that prevented its becoming the people's Bible.

In the version before us the attempt is made to keep all the good features of the American Standard Version without sacrificing the grand stylistic attributes that made the King James Version an English classic and, besides, an ideal book for public and private ownership.

The history of the present translation begins in 1928, when the copyright of the American Standard Version was transferred to the International Council of Religious Education, which is made up of the educational boards of forty Protestant denominations in the United States and Canada.

This council appointed a committee which was entrusted with such work as the text might require, including a revision if this should be considered necessary. It was stipulated that no changes should be made unless favored by at least two thirds of the membership of the committee. The work was started in 1930. The depression caused an interruption which lasted from 1932 to 1937. In the latter year the required funds were on hand, and the work could be continued. Naturally the committee was divided into two sections, one for the Old and the other for the New Testament. The Old Testament section, will, so it is hoped, complete its work by 1950.* The scholars who are responsible for the New Testament version now lying before us are: Prof. Walter Russell Bowie, Union Theological Seminary; Prof. Millar Burrows, Yale University; Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Harvard University; Prof. Clarence T. Craig, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology; Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed, University of Chicago; Prof. Frederick C. Grant, Union Theological Seminary; Prof. James Moffatt, Union Theological Seminary (died 1944); Dean Luther A. Weigle, Yale University Divinity School; President Abdel Ross Wentz, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg. Dean Weigle served as chairman of the committee.

In placing the work before us, the publishers remark, "The Publishers and the committee have made every effort to present this version in the most satisfactory format. The paragraphing is logical. Punctuation is modern and sensible. Poetry is printed as such. Cross references and occasionally necessary notes appear at the bottom of the page. The page size, the type, the length of type line, the margins, the styling of the type page—all have been chosen after consultation with competent typographers and book designers. The result is a volume beautifully appropriate to the presentation of God's Word." All these claims are justified: the book is beautiful to behold, a triumph of the printer's art, and of convenient size for the reader.

With much interest one reads about the methods followed by the committee in its work. Thirty-one meetings were held, every one of which on an average lasted from four to five days. As a rule, morning, afternoon, and evening sessions

* We are happy to state that our esteemed colleague Dr. G. V. Schick is one of the advisers of this section.

took place, each one three hours long. When a committee member had been assigned a New Testament book for translation, he made a preliminary draft and sent a copy to all the other members. At the next meeting of the committee his draft was scrutinized. Dr. Moffatt, who served as secretary, then made another draft of the translation, incorporating the alterations that had been adopted. The corrected version was again submitted to all the members of the committee. At the next meeting a further opportunity for emendations and corrections was given. It is evident that painstaking labors of the highest order went into the making of this New Standard Version.

Since Moffatt and Goodspeed, both eminent scholars, had issued translations of the New Testament of their own, one is curious to know whether the peculiarities of their personal versions have gained admittance in this revision. With satisfaction one finds that, as a rule, such is not the case. Moffatt's entirely inexcusable mistranslation of the words of institution of the Lord's Supper, which changed them into saying, "Take and eat this, it means My body," and Goodspeed's wrong rendering of the term "righteousness of God" in Romans, which he translates "the uprightness of God," are not repeated in this work. Seeing this, the reader begins to entertain the assurance that idiosyncrasies were suppressed and that not brilliant originality, but rather faithfulness to the text was the ideal which the committee sought to achieve.

That the planned return to the simplicity and force of the Authorized Version was accomplished, an example or two will readily demonstrate. The Foreword of Luke's Gospel reads in the new version: "Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things which have been accomplished among us, just as they were told to us by those who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word, it seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may know the truth concerning the things of which you have been informed." In the American Standard Version the translation of this Foreword had read: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us, even as they told them to us, who from

the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word, it seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed." In general, the Revised Standard Version rendering strikes one as far more virile and smooth than that of the American Standard Version. It is true that in one point the latter translates correctly and the Revised Standard Version incorrectly: ἀνωθεν does not mean "for some time past," but "from the first." Apart from this error, the superior excellence of the new rendering is evident.

To enter upon further details, one notices at once that the archaic forms of the pronouns "thou," "thee," "ye," have almost disappeared. "Thou" and "Thee" are retained when the Deity is addressed, though they are not used when Christ is spoken to. The seventeenth century verb forms are modernized. (It seems, however, that now and then consistency has been violated; for instance, in the quotation given Gal. 4:27 "thou" occurs twice in words not forming an address to the Deity. If the intention was to use the archaic pronoun in quotations from the Old Testament, this apparently was forgotten in Heb. 12:15. The verb forms have been given their modern appearance except when accompanying "Thou," but in Gal. 4:27, strange to say, "hath" has not been eliminated).†

The expressions that make present-day readers of the A. V. stumble have been altered, as they had been before in the A. S. V. With approval one observes that "bowels of mercies," Col. 3:12, has become "compassion"; "prevent," 1 Thess. 4:15, has become "preceding"; "let," 2 Thess. 2:7, has become "restrain." Here we ought to mention, too, that the long sentences of the A. V. often have been broken up into smaller parts, so that the meaning is more easily apprehended. We believe that the Epistles of St. Paul will now be read with far more satisfaction and profit by our laymen who have not made a professional study of the Holy Scriptures.

With amazement the reader finds that Moffatt's strange

† After this, abbreviations will be used for the three versions with which we are concerned: A. V. = Authorized Version; A. S. V. = American Standard Version; R. S. V. = Revised Standard Version.

rendering of "elements of the world" (A. V.) in Gal. 4:3, which he in his own version translated "elemental spirits of the world," has been taken over. The A. S. V. had rendered "rudiments of the world," which was quite acceptable. One is glad to see that Heb. 4:14, which in the A. V. reads that Jesus "has passed into the heavens," in the R. S. V. reads "has passed through the heavens." It is a correction which had been adopted in the A. S. V.

It is with regret that we see that the wrong, or at least ambiguous, translation of Jude 4 has not been altered sufficiently to remove the unsatisfactory feature. In speaking of the false teachers, Jude, according to the A. V., says that they were "ordained to this condemnation." The R. S. V. takes virtually the same view of the passage, rendering "long ago were designated for this condemnation." The A. S. V. had translated correctly thus: "who were of old written of beforehand unto this condemnation." Moffatt, too, in his own version had rendered properly: "their doom has been predicted long ago."

A positive mistranslation according to our conviction is introduced in 1 Tim. 3:2, when the R. S. V. renders "Now a bishop must be above reproach, married only once." The A. V. here has the correct translation "husband of one wife," which is likewise the rendering of the A. S. V. In this instance, too, Moffatt seems to have been the instigator, for in his own version he translates, speaking of the bishop, "he must be married only once." Of course, Goodspeed, too, translates "only once married." Here interpretation has taken the place of translation, and in our opinion there is no doubt that the sense of Scripture has been altered. The Apostle forbids polygamy in the case of bishops or elders, and it must not be overlooked that polygamy at that time was still widely practiced. If it should be replied that polygamy would be wrong not only for a bishop but for every parishioner, the rejoinder is that the other sins to which Paul points in this connection would be wrong for the parishioners, too, as well as for the bishops. Paul urges that the bishop should be an exemplar of his flock; hence, he mentions a number of virtues which should be found in him. The catalog is not exhaustive, but it indicates sufficiently how earnestly a minister must strive to practice the Christian conduct which he preaches.

Another source of regret is that questions of textual

criticism were not handled in a more conservative manner. Mark 16:9-20 is not printed as a part of the text, but in the lower margin. The omission of this passage, though advocated by some scholars who wish to be entirely loyal to the Scriptures, should not have been resolved on, because the evidence is not so clear and definite that every fair-minded person must declare the passage to be unguenuine. The same stricture applies to the omission of Luke 22:19 b, 20 in the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper. We are glad to see that in Luke 22:43, 44 the so-called "bloody sweat" passage, pertaining to the suffering of our Savior in Gethsemane, has not been eliminated, though Westcott and Hort printed it in brackets. Another passage of that kind which has been retained are the precious words of Jesus Luke 23:34: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Hort had arrived at the conclusion that though these words had actually been spoken by Jesus, they were not included in the original copy of the Gospel according to St. Luke. We gladly admit that where it is evident that a certain section handed down in the received text is not genuine, we should not make people believe that we think it is genuine, but, on the other hand, we hold that it is a sound principle that in matters of this kind, where we are dealing with what is most sacred and precious, alterations should not be made unless it is really necessary.

In conclusion, we can say that the R. S. V. is a valuable production, for which we should be very grateful. Excellent scholarship is represented here, and on the whole it has traveled in the proper channels. The book is now before the Church and will be studied by the clergy and the laity. It is too early to say whether the Church should make an effort to have this version take the place of the A. V., which is deeply enshrined in the language and the affections of our people.

P⁴⁶ and Textual Criticism

By ELMER MOELLER

(A Conference Essay)

Not always have Christians taken kindly to investigations into the exact identity of the inspired words of Holy Scriptures. After Jerome, for example, had edited his Vulgate, making changes in the generally accepted Latin text on the basis of Hebrew manuscripts, he received a letter from Augustine telling him of a certain congregation which had threatened to abandon its bishop unless he restored the old Latin reading of Jonah 4:6, which he had replaced with Jerome's reading.¹

In more modern times we are acquainted with the enthusiastic but ill-advised defense of the Textus Receptus made by J. W. Burgon and Edward Miller in their treatise *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*,² wherein they attempted to discredit the work of Westcott and Hort.

It was in castigation of the equanimity with which Protestants had accepted the edition of the New Testament text, the Textus Receptus, which the three Elzevirs, Isaac, Bonaventura, and Abraham, had taken in 1633 from their famous presses and which they had prefaced with the remark: "Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus,"³ that the English critic Samuel P. Tregelles wrote:

... Many Protestants ceased from all inquiry into the authorities on which the text of the Greek Testament in their hands was based; they received with a kind of traditional submission what the publishers presented to them; although they *might* have well known that the same care and attention are demanded as to the text of God's Holy Word as are bestowed upon ancient works of a value infinitely less. But so it was; and those who justly condemned the proceedings of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent, in 1545, in declaring the Latin Vulgate version authentic, and who showed the ignorance and

¹ Gregory, Caspar R., *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. 411.

² London, George Bell and Sons, 1896.

³ Von Dobschuetz, E., *Nestle's Einfuehrung in das griechische Neue Testament*, Vierte Auflage (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1923), p. 65.

weakness of the Papal decrees by which in 1590 and 1592 diverse editions of the Vulgate were declared to be exclusively genuine — were, in fact, following a Greek text which they had tacitly adopted as authentic; and they did this with as little intelligence as did the Romanists in their use of the Clementine Vulgate. . . . We need not wonder that Bentley should have spoken of "the Protestant Pope Stephens."⁴

Today the reverent student of God's Word is interested in every bit of progress in textual criticism. For, on the one hand, he knows that Christ has kept His promise to teach us all things.⁵ With this promise textual criticism has no conflict. For of all the variant readings of the New Testament which can be classified as of more importance than a small difference in spelling, not one affects or changes a teaching of the Bible. On the other hand, knowing that the holy writers spoke in the very words "which the Holy Ghost teacheth,"⁶ the student seeks diligently and reverently to make sure of each jot and tittle.

Of interest, therefore, is the recent development in New Testament textual criticism which has come through the discovery of Papyrus 46, or P⁴⁶, as it is generally known.

In 1930, A. Chester Beatty, an American collector of mss., who lives in London, acquired a number of papyrus leaves from a dealer in Egypt, which on examination were discovered to be "portions of codices of various books of the Greek Bible." The source of the mss., as closely as can be ascertained, is "the region of Aphroditopolis, on the right bank of the Nile, about thirty miles above Memphis," where presumably there was some early Christian church, a part of whose library the mss. represent.⁷

The mss. have been numbered by Prof. E. von Dobschuetz and Prof. A. Rahlfs, whose registers of the New Testament and of the Old Testament mss., respectively, are generally accepted, as follows: P⁴⁵, the Gospels and Acts; P⁴⁶, the Pauline Epistles; P⁴⁷, Revelation; 961, Genesis; 962, Genesis; 963, Numbers and Deuteronomy; 965, Isaiah;

⁴ *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 35-36.

⁵ John 14:26.

⁶ 1 Cor. 2:13.

⁷ Kenyon, Sir Frederic, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941), p. 126.

966, Jeremiah; 967, Ezekiel and Esther; 968, Daniel; and 964, Ecclesiasticus.⁸ Included in the mss. was also the Book of Enoch and a homily of unidentified authorship "on the passion of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the third quarter of the second century."⁹

As originally acquired, P⁴⁶ consisted of ten leaves. Soon after these had been published,

it was announced that the University of Michigan had acquired thirty more leaves of the same codex, in excellent condition. . . . Scarcely had these been published by Professor H. A. Sanders of Michigan, together with the ten Beatty leaves, when they were capped by the acquisition of Mr. Beatty of forty-six leaves more. The entire manuscript therefore consists, in its present state, of eighty-six nearly perfect leaves out of a total of 104, of which the last five were probably blank.¹⁰

The age of P⁴⁶ has been estimated variously. Despite Professor Sanders' statement that although he agrees with Kenyon as to the third century dating, he hesitates to emphasize the first half of the century,¹¹ Kenyon holds firm, "and further consideration," he remarks, "does not make me think this too early. On the contrary, Prof. Ulrich Wilken, who is universally recognized as the first living papyrologist, considers that it may even belong to the second century and that, at any rate, 'about A. D. 200' would be a safe dating."¹²

"If we are startled by this early attribution," writes H. C. Hoskier, "we have only to examine the text, in order to rest assured that we are in the presence of something which is contemporaneous with, or which may have preceded the compilation of the Sahidic version; thus, the circumstantial evi-

⁸ Kenyon, Sir Frederic, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus I* (London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933-1941), pp. 6-9.

⁹ Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, p. 126.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

¹¹ Sanders, Henry A., *A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935), p. 13.

¹² *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Fasc. III Supplement, p. xiv. Heinrich Seesemann, in "Der Chester-Beatty-Papyrus 46 und der Paulus-text des Clemens Alexandrinus," *Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche*, 36 (Berlin, 1937), p. 90, likewise refers to Wilken's statement from *Archiv fuer Papyrusforschung*, xi, 113.

dence is definite, for this is generally attributed to a period circa A. D. 190."¹³

One can readily understand the impact of the discovery of such a manuscript on New Testament textual criticism, particularly in the study of the Pauline Epistles which are contained in P⁴⁶. Heretofore the best manuscript authorities were the majuscule codices *Sinaiticus* (א) and *Vaticanus* (B), each of which is dated as from some time in the fourth century after Christ. Suddenly, however, the critic is whisked back through the years to the beginning of the third century, hardly a hundred years after the aged Apostle John was reading perhaps some of the original letters of St. Paul in Ephesus.

Just what does P⁴⁶ reveal to us?

First, let us see how far we have come without it.

In John 7:53—8:11 occurs one of the more important variant readings of the New Testament, the section of the woman taken in adultery. The evidence as given in Nestle's critical apparatus for and against the inclusion of this section is the following: supporting are the Koine text or Constantinople manuscripts, Codex D, and the majority of the remaining Greek manuscripts (excluding those mentioned below as opposed), old Latin manuscripts b (later European text), c, and e (oldest African text), ff² (later European), the Vulgate, and the Palestinian Syriac; opposed are the Alexandrian mss., Codex N, Codex Θ (representing Lake and Streeter's Caesarean text),¹⁴ other Greek manuscripts of less importance that are not mentioned, Latin manuscripts a¹fq (which approach the Vulgate), the important Syriac texts, Origen, and Tertullian.¹⁵

According to the more recent methods of interpretation of evidence, based on the studies of Lake, Streeter, and others, one would judge this evidence in the following way:

The Koine demonstrates that in Constantinople and in the medieval world the variant was accepted. Codex D demonstrates that in Italy the reading was acknowledged, and

¹³ "A Study of the Chester Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVIII (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937), p. 149.

¹⁴ Nestle, D. Eberhard and D. Erwin, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Editio sexta decima, Stuttgart, 1936, p. 48*.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

this is supported by the Latin mss. b and ff², and by the Vulgate. That a few, however, oppose acceptance would demonstrate that the opinion in Europe was divided. c and e of the Latin texts demonstrate that in North Africa the variant was accepted. On the other hand, Tertullian, resident in Africa, rejects it. The testimony of the Palestinian Syriac is opposed by the rest of the Syriac texts, the testimony of the latter also weakening that of the Koine. In opposition we find, in addition to the witnesses already mentioned, the entire weight of the Alexandrian texts, which include κ and B, showing that in Alexandria the variant was not accepted. In Caesarea also the variant was rejected, which strengthens the testimony of Origen against it, he having worked at Caesarea.

Summarizing the testimony, one would state that in Alexandria and Caesarea, centers of Christian culture, the variant had no standing. In Africa its genuineness was contested, in Rome also. In Antioch it was not supported, although it was accepted in Constantinople. The opinion, therefore, of the chief centers of Christian culture stands against it. Apparently, although it might be a true incident from Christ's life, it is not a part of the Fourth Gospel.

That, in general, is how far textual criticism has come in the Gospels. (If the principles of criticism which the writer has attempted to clarify have not been followed correctly, it is not because the principles are at fault, but because the application has not been sound.) "In the Gospels," because we tread on different ground in the Pauline Epistles. For instance, there has not been found a Caesarean text in the Pauline Epistles to correspond to the Θ text of the Gospels. Nor is the number of reputable mss. for the Epistles nearly so great as it is for the Gospels. The critic, so far as the writer knows, has therefore, up to the present time, not been able to determine what was the accepted variant in the several centers of Christian culture in the case of the Pauline Letters. It has therefore been necessary in critical studies in the Pauline Epistles to fall back on the principles of Westcott and Hort, who were influenced chiefly, and, as we would now say, unduly, by the testimony of Codices κ and B.¹⁶ Briefly

¹⁶ Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, p. 39*; Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Fasc. I, pp. 15-17.

summarized,¹⁷ the three groups into which Westcott and Hort divided the critical testimony and from them picked what seemed to be the best testimony, are the following:

The most recent type of text is the Syrian (substantially the *Textus Receptus* and our King James Version), which is preserved almost pure in the majority of the minuscules, as well as in the later majuscules. It is present especially in the *Peshitta* and *Harclean Syriac* versions,¹⁸ although "all the versions from the fourth century onwards are more or less Syrian in text, among which Latin mss., like *f* and *q* and the Gothic Version, are prominent."¹⁹ In Nestle's *New Testament*, the Syrian text corresponds to the *Koine* text.

The Syrian text is of least importance, since apparently "the authors . . . had before them the documents representing at least three earlier forms of text: Western, Alexandrian, a third."²⁰ The reason for the mixture of documents, it is assumed, results from the destruction of mss. under Diocletian's persecution (284—305), in which whole regions were undoubtedly robbed of texts, necessitating the procurement of copies from elsewhere.²¹

Of the Alexandrian text "hardly a pure witness remains, but many traces are found in a number of mss. of the better class" (in the Pauline Epistles & ACP); "also in the *Sahidic* and *Bohairic* versions, especially the latter; further, in the *Armenian*, the *Latin Vulgate* (or another revised Latin text), the *Alexandrian Fathers*."²²

¹⁷ Souter, Alexander, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. 118.

¹⁸ The Syriac *Peshitta* represents a probable Syriac revision, indicated by the existence of the older *Curetonian Syriac Gospel*, and the almost total extinction of other Old Syriac mss., contrasted with the great number of extant *Vulgate* (*Peshitta*) Syriac mss., and by the narrow range of variation found in the *Vulgate Syriac* mss. The revision was probably done at Edessa or Nisibis, centers of Syrian ecclesiastical life. The *Antiochian* text, found in the *Antiochian Fathers*, represents a revision at Antioch, which was taken as a standard for a similar authoritative revision of the Syriac text, which later was subjected to a second revision, which the *Vulgate Syriac* did not undergo, but which is found in the *Harclean Syriac*. *Lucianus of Antioch* was probably the moving spirit of the revisions.—Westcott, B., and Hort, F., *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Introduction and Appendix (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882), pp. 136—138.

¹⁹ Souter, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

²⁰ Westcott and Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

²² Souter, *op. cit.*, pp. 125—126.

The Western text, of which Westcott and Hort remark that it was the most widely spread text of Ante-Nicene times, and sooner or later every version directly or indirectly felt its influence,²³ is found pure, for the Pauline Epistles, in DGF, "with the chief Old-Latin mss. and the Fathers, . . . and the Greek (non-Alexandrian) Ante-Nicean Fathers." Many Western readings are found, however, in κ , B, "Latin Vulgate, Syriac versions, Sahidic, Armenian, Gothic (especially), Ethiopic."²⁴

The third type of text represented in the Syrian text is what Westcott and Hort called the Neutral text, made up of Pre-Syrian non-Western readings, and found chiefly in B and κ , although B in Paul "has here and there Western readings," and κ likewise. Also H and M have preserved much Neutral text in the Pauline Epistles.²⁵

The practical effect of following Westcott and Hort is to accept the testimony of κ and B as of supreme importance. Testimony of A is accepted only if it agrees with κ and B or with either of the two. Testimony of D is worth something only if it agrees with κ and B. When κ and B disagree, the reading in which D agrees is possibly the better. A reading which D alone has is a peculiar Western reading, an orphan in the world of textual criticism. The testimony of minuscules and of the Fathers is of importance only as it gives additional light to the picture which we find portrayed in the testimony of κ and B.

The question now is, Does P⁴⁶ change anything?

Neither time nor space permit the presentation of all the evidence and reasoning by which one might show just why and how P⁴⁶ has changed the picture. But the change itself one can set forth.

Investigation of the text of P⁴⁶ in the Epistle to the Romans, an investigation made by comparing the evidence of the majuscules in some 333 variant readings which are more than mere differences in spelling, gives us the following overview of textual development:

At the end of the second century A.D. there were throughout the Mediterranean world texts of the Pauline Epistles which contained a mixture of what we call Western

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 120.

²⁴ Souter, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 122, 125.

and Alexandrian readings. The Neutral text of Westcott and Hort would be included in this conglomerate text, which we might well call the "mixed" text. P⁴⁶ is an example of a ms. which contains such a text, for not only does it have the basic text on which all the New Testament mss. agree, but it also contains within it the peculiar readings which Westcott and Hort called Neutral, which were to be found in so-called Western texts, and most important of all, Western readings which heretofore have been unexplained, which have been accounted by critics as malformations of no definite origin. Like Topsy, they supposedly "just growed." For example, Codices F and G, of ninth-century origin, have heretofore shown readings which could not be explained and were peculiar to these mss. Now we find them in P⁴⁶.

New Testament scholars of the third century, however, were not content to leave the text so unfettered, to allow the different readings to be perpetuated by copyists. So the scholars took up editors' pencils. Here a variant was deleted; there another. The result is what we call the Alexandrian recension, possibly the work of Hesychius, whom Jerome mentions.²⁶ The recension was not, we assume, the result of a single effort in text revision at one particular time, but the accumulated work of years. At any rate, we have as a result what we call the great Alexandrian mss., Codices ABC. From them have disappeared many of the readings of the "mixed" text. The text of the New Testament has become more standardized.

Meanwhile the "mixed" text was used throughout the Mediterranean world, in Syria, Asia Minor, Italy, Africa, even in Gaul and England. Some localities began to play favorites with some of the variants, as we saw in the example of the variant of the woman taken in adultery. But even such favoritism was a part of the freedom of the "mixed" text tradition.

Then there came, at the end of the third century, in the eastern Mediterranean world the Diocletian persecution. Whole regions of Asia Minor and Syria were swept bare of their sacred manuscripts. When finally, under Constantine the Great, order began to appear, it was found that there were no Bibles for the churches. Constantine therefore

²⁶ von Dobschuetz, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

ordered fifty from Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea,²⁷ to which number, some think, belong Codices *N* and *B*.²⁸ These naturally were copies of mss. which showed the efforts of Alexandrian editing. As a result, the Constantinople mss., the Koine text of Nestle, are largely Alexandrian, the variations from the Alexandrian text to be accounted for by remnants of the "mixed" text, which survived in a few manuscripts that had not been destroyed, in the Syriac versions, and in the memories of the Constantinople scribes, who made copies of the texts which they received from Eusebius.

The culture of the western Mediterranean was for the greater part destroyed by the barbarian hordes. Many of the mss. of the "mixed" text perished. The dark ages of Christian culture set in. When learning in the West finally revived, it was from Constantinople that it drew nourishment. Scholars and texts from the East nurtured study of the New Testament in the original. The natural result would be the multiplication of mss. with the Constantinople text and the acceptance of the Constantinople text as the *Textus Receptus*, for the simple reason that there were no manuscripts of the "mixed" text to be had. Some, e. g., *D* and *E*, had survived, however. The safeguarding of Western Christian culture in Irish monasteries accounts for the perpetuation of the "mixed" text in such manuscripts of later date, e. g., in Codices *F* and *G*. The only thing is, it took the finding of P⁴⁶ to demonstrate that the peculiar Western readings of mss. like *F* and *G* are just as old as the preferred readings of Codices *N* and *B*, and in some instances may indeed be God's own Word, hidden through many centuries.

This picture leaves much to be desired in way of proof. That must come elsewhere. The picture, however, is merely a composite of various conclusions drawn from the study of P⁴⁶ by the writer.

1. The Constantinople mss., as sole testimony, are of little importance. When they join with the Alexandrian mss., they demonstrate that the East adopted the Alexandrian tradition.

2. The Syriac text is a witness for the præcension "mixed" text. The Syriac *Peshitta* is generally a second-century witness when it differs from the *Harclean Syriac*.

²⁷ Gregory, *Canon and Text*, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 326—7, 336—7, 339.

Either, however, may prove to be the older or better witness, depending on the supporting testimony.

3. The Armenian version is a follower of the Syriac and Constantinople texts.

4. The Alexandrian majuscules, including P⁴⁶, united, represent a very important ancient text. Divided, they represent two types of text called by the writer Western and Alexandrian, the relative value of which must be decided by the weight of their respective support.

5. The Bohairic and Sahidic versions are good second-century witnesses.

6. DEFG represent a very good second-century text, a reading of which is probably of the same antiquity as that of an opposing P⁴⁶ABC reading. Divided, they represent different texts, each of which probably goes back to the second century, each of which must be judged on the basis of supporting evidence.

7. The Itala, or old Latin version, represents a second-century text. Where the Itala testimony is divided, supporting evidence must decide which reading is to be preferred.

8. The Vulgate, in agreement with the Itala, supports the same original text as does the Itala. When opposed, its value must be determined by the witnesses of the reading which it supports.

9. The Fathers, in general, represent the text of their locality and age. The Constantinople Fathers reproduce generally the Constantinople and Syriac texts. Origen and Clement represent prærecension texts. Irenaeus represents a second-century text, both in the Greek and in the Latin, the latter being possibly the early Itala text, possibly an accurate translation of his original Greek text. Tertullian represents both second-century original Greek and the earliest Itala texts. Cyprian represents the Itala. Ambrosiaster and Hilary represent the mixed Latin tradition which preceded the Vulgate.

10. A demonstrably second-century reading is better than a later reading. When two readings are demonstrably second-century, the number of supporting witnesses (e. g., Itala, Syriac Peshitta, Sahidic, DEFG are each a witness) must determine the better reading. When two readings seem to have equal testimonial merit, an analysis of their essential worth on the basis of hermeneutical principles must be made.

To illustrate these principles, one might apply them to a variant reading taken from Rom. 6:12. There we read αὐτῇ with P⁴⁶DEFGdfg Ir Or Tert. *ABC*α7H0480142vgssahcop syr^{sch} (Peshitta) arm aeth Or (five times) Meth Aug Dam have ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. C^cKLP have αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ.

The testimony of the Constantinople, KLP, is definitely to be discounted, for it represents a perfect example of a conflate reading. P⁴⁶ represents part of the second-century tradition, *ABC another part. It is therefore evident that both readings existed side by side. DEFG represents a witness for αὐτῇ, the combined group of Western majuscules. It also indicates several streams of Greek testimony, converging into one unit. In the writer's opinion P⁴⁶DEFG balance *ABC*. Irenaeus is a part of the P⁴⁶DEFG tradition, and adds nothing. dfg, supplemented by Tertullian, furnish another witness for αὐτῇ as a second century reading. That e, however, disagrees, as does also Aug, weakens the Itala evidence somewhat. Origen's testimony is split, with his heavier approval on the longer reading. The Peshitta is a strong witness. The selection of e's testimony by the vg is presaged by Aug. That α7H-0142 abandon their usual Constantinople position is not too strong a testimony, but it adds weight to the witness of the Alexandrian group.

The witnesses therefore seem to balance thus:

P⁴⁶DEFG Ir vs. ABC*α7H-0142 Meth Dam
 dfg Tert vs. sah cop
 Or vs. Or

The remaining witnesses, syr^{sch} arm, vg Aug, aeth, throw the balance definitely in favor of the longer reading.

To conclude this inadequate handling of a subject too great for so short a consideration: these principles of criticism in the Pauline Epistles, applied in the foregoing example, are the result of preliminary, albeit thorough, studies in the Romans text of P⁴⁶. They represent a hypothesis. It will take much more study in P⁴⁶ to test it. May there be scholars interested in, and willing to do, this work.

Bismarck, N. Dak.



Homiletics

Outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons

CANTATE

JAMES 1:16-21

Much time and effort is consumed by men to learn the source of evil. Physicians seek to ascertain the causes of disease; students of history strive to know the factors that lead to war; psychiatrists attempt to uncover the beginnings of mental abnormality; educators discuss the causes of juvenile delinquency. If we are so deeply interested in the source of evil, how much more willing should we be to learn

THE SOURCE OF GOOD

- I. Good comes from God*
- II. Good comes from Christians*

I

Every good gift comes from God (v. 16), and He is called the "Father of lights." Light is the source of many of the good things we have: plant life, grain, fruit. Without light most growing things would die. Light is also a therapeutic agent, and physicians use it for the cure of disease. Light is the source of good, and God is the Father of lights. He created light. He is the ultimate source of good. That is very evident when we think of our life in this world. Rain and sunshine are from God (Matt. 5:45). All receive their needs from Him (Ps. 145:15, 16). God is Lord over the universe and governs the world. God is always the source of good. The created lights are subject to variableness and shadow, eclipses and phases, but God is always the same. Men change, too, in their willingness to be helpful and weary of being kind, but God never changes.

One of the greatest gifts of God is regeneration, v. 18. We do not make ourselves Christians; God does it through the means of grace, Holy Baptism and the "Word of Truth," the Gospel (Titus 3:5; 2 Tim. 1:9). The change that is wrought in a man by God is so great that it is like being born all over again, being born a different person. The Christian

becomes a kind of first fruits of God's creatures, dedicated to God and belonging to Him. All the spiritual good that we have, our faith, the forgiveness of our sin, our hope of heaven, is all a gift of God. He is the source of all good.

II

Good also comes from Christians. Natural man cannot produce anything that is good in God's sight (Gen. 8:1; Rom. 7:18; John 3:6). But a *regenerate person* brings forth much good. The Father of lights has shined into the Christian's heart with the Gospel (2 Cor. 4:6), giving him knowledge of Christ and saving faith. And then the Christian begins to give forth light, too. He is like the phosphorescent cross that is seen on the walls of Christian homes. When the room becomes dark, the cross glows with the light that it has received. The Christian gives forth the light of love and good deeds (John 15:5). He battles against sin (Rom. 7:22); he grows constantly in virtue (2 Pet. 1:5); he becomes zealous to do good (Titus 2:14).

The text points out some of the good that comes from Christians (v. 19-20). We hear a great deal, and much of it is evil. But we should not spread the evil that we hear (James 4:11; Matt. 18:15). Instead, we should be the source of good, defending our neighbor (Prov. 31:8-9); speaking well of him (1 Sam. 19:4); and putting the best construction on everything. How much good could be done in the world if all Christians would observe these simple directions of the Eighth Commandment!

The Christian will be the source of good if he curbs his wrath and guards his temper. Much harm comes from wrath (v. 20). Harsh words, spoken in anger, cause enmity to arise in families, among friends, between employer and employee, and sometimes even in Christian churches. There ensue bitter accusations, burning hatreds, and often harmful violence. The Christian strives hard to subdue anger and wrath when it arises in his heart, for he knows what is written (Matt. 5:22; 1 John 3:15). He remembers the story of Cain. Instead, the Christian strives to be gentle and kind, forgiving and generous in all his contacts with others. What a different world it would be — a better world to live in — if all Christians would constantly strive in this way to be the source of good!

Verse 21 points to the filthiness, lewdness, vice and shame that is prevalent in the world and that produces so much harm and sorrow, broken homes, destitute families, diseased bodies and abject misery and poverty. The Christian will not aid in causing all this evil, but will instead be decent and clean and pure for his own sake and as an example to others. He will thus be the source of good.

To effect all this, to continue to be a source of good, the Christian will receive and heed the Word of God that has been implanted into his heart. The Gospel will strengthen his faith, help him to be a source of good, and save his soul.

FREDERIC NIEDNER

ROGATE

JAMES 1:22-27

Rogate — Prayer Sunday. The Bible often warns against prayer which is insincere and a mere prattle of the lips.

This epistle warns against another type of insincerity: hearing without doing.

"BE YE DOERS OF THE WORD AND NOT HEARERS ONLY"

Let us consider

- I. *The hearer who is a hearer only*
- II. *The hearer who is also a doer*

I

A. The text does not deal with the heathen who have never heard of God's Word, nor with the so-called unchurched who regularly refuse to attend the preaching of the Word; it deals with those who hear, people of the visible Church.

B. Among the hearers there are those who are hearers only. Their characteristics:

a. They are like a man who looks at himself in a looking glass (vv. 23-24). In a looking glass we see only our *outward* appearance; internal conditions are not revealed. It is a superficial self-examination — "straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was."

So a mere hearer — his hearing and reading of the Word is merely superficial. At best he has an intellectual interest

in a sermon or in the study of the Bible. He merely performs the outward duty of sitting in church during the service. "Hearing they hear not," (Matt. 13:13, 19).

b. Such hearers "seem to be religious" (v. 26), *i. e.*, they "consider themselves religious" but do not realize what implications this has for life. Ex.: They seem religious but bridle not the tongue (v. 26). Their lives belie their profession of faith. They are only Sunday Christians, church members who in their occupation, their business, their amusements are children of this world.

c. Such hearers "deceive their own selves" (v. 22). They may indeed deceive also their fellow men, but first of all they deceive themselves. While they consider themselves good Christians, God would say of them: "I never knew you." The sham church member, the forgetful hearer, the work-for-appearance-only Christians — all deceive themselves worst of all.

II

A. Who is such a "doer of the Word"?

Not one who rejects hearing the Word and tries to compensate therefor by "good deeds."

But "whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein" (v. 25). The perfect law of liberty is the Gospel (v. 21: "able to save your souls"), the "truth which makes us free" (John 8:32). The "doer" is first of all a believer in the Gospel. Without such faith and trust no man's deeds are acceptable to God.

B. The doer "looketh into" the perfect law of liberty, *i. e.*, he "stoops to look at it carefully." His is not a superficial consideration of God's Word, but a searching and diligent application to himself.

C. Such doing of the Word includes deeds of love (v. 27). Faith and good deeds always go hand in hand.

Such deeds may be directed to others: care of the unfortunate, the suffering, the needy; such deeds apply also to our own selves: "to keep himself unspotted from the world."

This text is an urge to diligent self-examination by church members.

H. O. A. KEINATH

ASCENSION DAY

Acts 1:1-11

During these days the children, wives, and parents of veterans are anxiously awaiting the homecoming of their loved ones. When the veterans get back home, what joys are theirs — the joys of reunion, of homecoming.

On Ascension Day we speak of one homecoming and look at the preparations for another.

I

A. The Savior had finished His work of living and dying in our stead (active and passive obedience). He had left His Father's home to go out and accomplish this. The Father had placed His approval on the work of His Son — the resurrection on Easter Day.

B. Before He returned home, Jesus showed Himself to His disciples repeatedly over a period of 40 days. Eating with them — not because He needed food to keep from starving — but to convince the disciples that He who had been dead was now alive. No ghost or phantom. The Apostles had to know the crucified and risen Lord — the theme and content of their message.

C. On the 40th day on the Mount of Olives He was calmly and grandly lifted up. They saw Him go up. A visible departure.

D. Picture entrance into throne room of heaven. Innumerable hosts of angels welcome the God-Man. The Father says, "Sit Thou at My right hand" (Ps. 110:1), the place of honor, the place of power. He had done His work well, and He must be honored for it.

E. Even though we no longer have His visible presence, He says, "Lo, I am with you alway" (Matt. 28:20).

F. He will come again; all mankind shall see Him. But before that final day, Judgment or Resurrection Day, He is preparing for another homecoming.

II

A. The disciples were to remain in Jerusalem until the Baptism in the Holy Ghost. Ten days later this promise of the Father came true. The disciples were given power ($\deltaύναμις$).

They were to preach the Gospel, which St. Paul calls the power of God (δύναμις θεοῦ). That Gospel was to be the dynamics the world needed. It was to turn the world upside down; really, right side up.

B. With this power of God, the Gospel, the disciples (1 Pet. 2:9) were to bring others into the Kingdom of God, which consists of disciples of Jesus, the world's Sin-Bearer.

C. Jesus turns away from the fleshly, nationalistic idea of an earthly kingdom and gives the disciples the program "Ye shall be testifiers of Me." They should tell the world who He is and what He has done in place of man.

D. Ever-broadening sphere of influence: home missions to foreign missions — universal teaching.

E. Jesus, the great Director of Missions, would be with them invisibly (Matt. 28) and would bless the Cross-centered teaching (Is. 55). They are assured of success.

F. This will continue until He comes again. The first homecoming was a joy to Christ Jesus and His Father. The next homecoming, when Jesus comes to take us to Himself, will be a joy for us, for we shall then be with Christ forever.

G. The first homecoming and the preparations for another illustrated in a *legend*: "When the Lord returned triumphantly to heaven on Ascension Day, He was asked by an angel what plans He had made for the future of His kingdom. 'I am leaving it to Peter and Paul and John, to Mary and Martha.' 'But what if they fail you — if Peter goes back to his fishing and Paul to his tentmaking and Mary and Martha to their housekeeping?' He was asked. He answered, 'I have made no other provision. I am counting on them!'" (Martin Ilse, 3d Medit., Stud. Pastors' Conference, 1946.)

H. The glory which is ours. The great God, our Savior and Redeemer, has called me into His service. He has given me a commission, me, formerly a rebel, but now His adopted child. I am to be His co-worker, His representative, the ambassador of the King of Kings, to be His witness that through this testifying others may join me in His kingdom of forgiveness so that when He comes again, others and I may enter into the homecoming festivities with joy. *Soli Deo Gloria.*

F. L. NEEBE

EXAUDI

1 PET. 4: 7-11

The First Epistle of Peter contains chiefly a series of exhortations unto a Christian life based on the fact that Christians are regenerated children of God and have a sure hope of eternal life (c. 1: 3-12). But it also deals with the fact that Christians as strangers and pilgrims in a wicked world must suffer much at the hands of this world and that in view of their hope they are able to undergo such suffering with courage (3: 13—4: 6, 12-19). Since their cross does not exempt the Christians from continuing in sanctification, the exhorting paragraph of our text is inserted in the midst of statements that Christians have and must expect much suffering.—This suffering is evidence that the wicked world is hastening to its end, its doom. God will be moved soon to avenge and rescue His saints by coming to judgment (v. 7 a). So the time when Christians can work is short, and that is an incentive (frequent in Scripture; cp. James 5: 8; Heb. 10: 25; Matt. 3: 2; 4: 17; 10: 7) for greater efforts toward sanctification.

A THREEFOLD ADMONITION IN VIEW OF THE NEARNESS
OF THE END OF ALL THINGS

I

To Pray Diligently (v. 7 b c).—The Greek has the plural “prayers.” Much and regular praying is called for, since even in good days we can do nothing without God, much less in evil days (cp. Luke 21: 36; Matt. 26: 41); especially should Christians pray for the coming of the Lord (Rev. 22: 20). But to pray in the right spirit soberness and watchfulness are required, a well-balanced mind, self-mastery, moderation. The second verb is synonymous: withdrawal of the thoughts from earthly things, sorrows, joys, and delectations. To pray properly a Christian must not be excited by passions and desires. The first verb emphasizes in particular mental sobriety, the second one, bodily.

II

To be Persevering in Brotherly Love (vv. 8-9).—Peter now takes up the right behavior toward men: fervent, that is, unceasing, constant love. That must be as persistent as prayer (Acts 12:5; Luke 18:1). This is the Apostle’s third

reminder of brotherly love (cp. ch. 1:22; 3:8). Christians evidently need such admonition. This love is apt to grow weary, since it must put up with much sin in the brethren. Yet it alone can do what is required: cover up a multitude of sins by not imputing them to the brother (Matt. 18: 21 f.), and by not divulging them to others. In case of unrepented sins of the brother, love cannot stop with covering up; it will be constrained to admonish (Matt. 18: 15 ff.). This action of love makes for peace among brethren in the Church, but "hatred stirreth up strife" (see Prov. 10: 12). — Another much needed action of love is "hospitality without grudging," which is litotes for hospitality with joy and alacrity. It was especially necessary in the case of the persecuted Christians. Cp. Rom. 12: 13; 2 Cor. 9: 7.

III

To be Faithful in Administering the Manifold Gifts of God (vv. 10-11). — These verses refer in particular to congregational life, whereas the previous admonition had reference to the behavior of individual Christians. V. 10 speaks of all spiritual gifts, not only the extraordinary ones of the early Church, but also the ordinary ones found among Christians in general. No Christian is without one or the other or several of these gifts. God is the originator of these gifts; we are only stewards. We must employ, according to the Giver's will, only what was given, but all of that, and give God the credit. Cp. 1 Cor. 4: 7; Luke 12: 42; 16: 1 ff.; 1 Cor. 4: 1 ff. — V. 11 adds two examples of such charismatic gifts. 11 a: "Oracles," God's own pronouncements; cp. Acts 7: 38; Rom. 3: 2; Heb. 5: 12. Christians are to speak God's words given to them freely as God's gifts (1 Thess. 2: 13). These words are found in the Bible. The reference is not only to preachers and teachers, but also to lay Christians. It is taken for granted that Christians preach and teach this Word, but they should do it with the consciousness that it is God's Word and insist on its importance, power, and acceptability. — The other example (v. 11 b) is ministration, both official and lay services to the poor, sick, and stranger. But again Christians are told that this, too, is a gift of God; the strength and ability is not theirs, but God's. To Him they must look for it all, and to Him they must give the credit. They will also have to give account for their stewardship to Him when the end of

all things comes. — Finally (v. 11 c), the purpose of all speaking and serving in the Kingdom is God's glory, through Christ reflected in the believers (Rom. 8:30 b). Christ is the source of power in the Christians which glorifies God. — The doxology refers to Christ and proves His true deity.

When the end of all things comes, the Christians will be enabled to live a life of perfect sanctification to the glory of God through Christ.

F. S. WENGER

PENTECOST

Acts 2:1-13

All Christendom rejoices at Christmas over the birth of the Christ Child and at Easter over the resurrection of Christ from the dead. At Pentecost we rejoice particularly over the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, who is the Comforter, sent by the Father in the Son's name (John 14:26). Let us

REJOICE IN THE COMING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

- I. *He comes to lead you to Jesus, your Savior*
- II. *He comes to keep you in the communion of saints*

I

After Jesus' ascension into heaven the disciples waited in Jerusalem according to the word of their Lord. On the tenth day, as they were assembled in a certain house, the Pentecost miracle took place. Their hearts, minds, and lips having been touched by the Holy Spirit, they were able to preach the wonderful works of God in the tongues of many people gathered in Jerusalem from many countries far and near.

The Holy Spirit, who gave these men utterance to speak with other tongues, is not an influence or a power of God, but Very God Himself. Scripture speaks of Him as a person, for He teaches (John 14:26), testifies (John 15:26), reproves (John 16:8), shows, glorifies (John 16:13-14), leads (Rom. 8:14), knows the things of God (1 Cor. 2:11), speaks (Acts 13:2), forbids (Acts 16:6), can be resisted (Acts 7:51), despised (Heb. 10:29), blasphemed (Mark 3:29). Scripture, furthermore, calls Him God (Luke 1:35; Acts 5:4; 1 Cor. 3:16; 12:4-6) and ascribes the properties of God to Him: eternity

(Heb. 9:14), omnipresence (Ps. 139:7-10), omnipotence (Luke 1:35), omniscience (1 Cor. 2:10; John 14:29; 16:12-13).

Of this Holy Spirit St. Paul says, "No man can say," etc. (1 Cor. 12:3). Witness the preaching of the Apostles on the first Pentecost day, especially that of St. Peter (vv. 6, 11, 41).

In the explanation of the Third Article of the Apostles' Creed we confess, "I believe . . . in the true faith." Every one of us who bears the name Christian and clings to Jesus as his Savior has been brought to the foot of the Cross by the Holy Spirit. He enables us to follow the word "Repent" (Mark 1:15; Matt. 4:17). He gives us the strength to say, "I believe; help Thou mine unbelief" (Mark 9:24). He assures us of forgiveness of sin, peace with God (Rom. 5:1), everlasting life (John 3:36).

Oh, rejoice in the Holy Spirit, who leads you to Jesus, your Savior!

II

Again I say, Rejoice in the Holy Spirit because He keeps you in the communion of saints! On the first Pentecost day thousands of people from many surrounding countries (vv. 9-11) heard the wonderful works of God in their own tongues, and many of them believed. The seed of faith, which the Holy Spirit planted in their hearts, flourished in their home areas. There, too, the Holy Spirit exercised His power through the Gospel and called, enlightened, gathered, sanctified others in the true faith and added them to the communion of saints. Thus He works from generation to generation.

The dangers that confronted the communion of saints in the past were just as great as those which confront the followers of Jesus today. But the Holy Spirit has always strengthened and preserved the Christian (1 Pet. 1:5; Phil. 1:6; 1 Thess. 5:23-24; Rom. 8:31-39). He builds up our faith on the Bread of Life in the Gospel (John 6:33-71) so that we can resist temptation (1 Pet. 5:8-9), so that we are not overcome by the cares of this world (Luke 8:4-15). He teaches us how to use the shield of faith and how to wield the sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:16-17). He leads us in the good fight of faith (1 Tim. 6:12). He gives us the willingness to endure to the end (Matt. 10:22; Rev. 2:10).

But the Holy Spirit not only keeps you in the communion of saints, He wants to use you to bring others into the same

communion with you. He opens your ears to hear the great command (Matt. 28:19-20). He lifts up your eyes to see the great harvest (Matt. 9:37-38). He loosens your tongue to say, "Here am I; send me" (Is. 6:8). He will give you the joy of the seventy in your work under His guidance (Luke 10:17). Oh, be eager to enter the open doors in this postwar world!

Rejoice in the Holy Spirit, who keeps you and others in the communion of saints now and forever (1 Pet. 1:3-5; 2 Cor. 3:18; 2 Tim. 4:18)!

ALEX WM. C. GUEBERT

PENTECOST MONDAY

Acts 10:42-48 a

Christians are temples of God, in whom the Spirit of God dwells (1 Cor. 3:16). Without the indwelling of the Holy Spirit a person cannot be a member of Christ's body (Rom. 8:9). The presence of the Holy Spirit in a believer is unto him a seal that he is a son of God (Rom. 8:14). In the text before us we read of the coming of the Holy Ghost into the hearts of men. Since it is of the utmost importance that we have the Holy Ghost, let us consider

THE OUTPOURING OF THE HOLY GHOST

We learn

- I. *What is meant by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost*
- II. *How the Holy Ghost is poured out on mankind*
- III. *Who can receive the Holy Ghost*

I

A. "The Holy Ghost fell upon them" (v. 44). This cannot mean that previous to this time the Holy Ghost had not been with these people. He is omnipresent (Jer. 23: 23, 24; Ps. 139: 7-10). Cornelius was a devout man (Acts 10: 2). The statement "the Holy Ghost fell upon them" must signify that He was present in a different manner and made His presence felt in various ways.

B. The new presence of the Holy Ghost was evidenced by "speaking with tongues" (v. 46). Peter recognized the same gift which he and others had received on Pentecost. The charismatic gifts served a wholesome purpose in the early

history of the Church, but they were not an essential feature in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. Contrary to the teachings of the Pentecostals and similar sects we learn from 1 Cor. 12: 28-30 that not all believers, although they did have the Holy Ghost, had these extraordinary gifts.

C. "They magnified God" (v. 46). This is essential in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. To magnify means to glorify, to praise. There must be a reason for praising God. Cornelius and his household were assured by the Holy Ghost that they had remission of sins. Such assurance is the work of the Holy Ghost (Rom. 8: 14, 17).

D. "Magnified God" means also that these people glorified God by a sanctified life, cf. Phil. 1: 20. This, too, the result of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost (Gal. 5: 22-26).

Thus the outpouring of the Holy Ghost consists in this, that the Holy Ghost gives us the assurance that we are children of God and the ability to lead a Christian life. Have you received the Holy Ghost?

II

A. "The gift of the Holy Ghost was poured out on the Gentiles" (v. 45). In Acts 11: 17 Peter calls God the Giver of this gift. The Holy Ghost, accordingly, does not come to us through man-devised means (enthusiasts), but by the means ordained by God.

B. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word" (v. 44). Through the preaching of the Word of God the Holy Ghost was poured out on Cornelius and his household. The Word of God is the means, the only means, through which the Holy Ghost comes to man. The Sacraments are efficacious because the Word of God is connected with the visible elements.

C. Peter preached the Law (v. 42), but the Holy Ghost did not come during the preaching of the Law. The Law reveals sin, guilt, and judgment. It terrifies and kills (2 Cor. 3: 6), but it does not give the Holy Ghost (Gal. 3: 2). Still the preaching of the Law is necessary.

D. While Peter was preaching the Gospel, the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the Word (vv. 43-44). V. 43 summarizes the Gospel. The Gospel not only reveals what God has done for mankind; it is the power of God through which

the Holy Ghost convinces sinners that God is reconciled (2 Cor. 5: 19, 20) and enables the believers in Christ to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God (Rom. 12: 1; 1 John 4: 11, 19).

Do we give the Holy Ghost an opportunity to come to us by the diligent use of the means of grace?

III

A. Cornelius was a Gentile. When he and his household received the gift of the Holy Ghost, they of the circumcision were astonished (v. 45). Cf. also Acts 11: 1-18. The visible demonstration of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on Gentiles proved to them that He and His gifts were not to be confined to a certain race or group of people. Peter could not refuse Baptism to Cornelius and his household as a seal of their faith (vv. 47-48 a), engendered by the Gospel of Christ crucified.

B. The Gospel is intended for all. Wherever the Gospel is preached, the Holy Ghost is poured out. Whosoever accepts the Gospel and believes in Christ for the remission of sins receives the Holy Ghost (Col. 3: 11).

Let us, therefore, be diligent in the use of the means of grace, so that we receive a full measure of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Let us be zealous to carry out the command of our Savior to preach the Gospel to every creature.

WALTER A. BAEPLER

TRINITY SUNDAY

ROM. 11:33-36

As the Apostle, in concluding the doctrinal section of his great Epistle to the Romans, lifts up his heart and voice in a beautiful and powerful doxology, so we Christians of these latter days may well summarize the facts brought home to us during the festival season of the church year in this beautiful hymn of praise, which presents to us

THE UNSEARCHABLE GOD IN HIS RELATION TO THE BELIEVERS

- I. In His essence and attributes*
- II. In His works*

I

A. We are reminded of the depth of His riches. There are treasures hidden in God which are unplumbed depths, which no man's reason can sound. This is true of every quality, of every attribute of the God of the Bible. Here we are constrained to praise the riches of His *wisdom*, of the essential fund of truth contained in Him, who was thereby enabled to find a way of bringing salvation to fallen mankind in and through His Son, the God-Man. (V. 33 a.) And with this wisdom is associated His *knowledge* or understanding, by which He was fully acquainted with the needs of mankind in the depths of their foolish enmity against Him.—These two attributes of God are so far above and beyond human comprehension that the Apostle, employing the contents of several Old Testament passages, is constrained to cry out: V. 34. As God lives in a light into which no man can enter, so His mind is beyond human conception and comprehension. Cp. Is. 40:13; Job 41:3. It is presumption for any human being even to think that he could serve as a counselor to the all-wise God in His dealings with the children of men.

B. This fact is brought out by the unsearchable quality and character of God's ways and judgments. Past finding out are the ways of His grace which brought us to faith, preserves us in this faith, although we are not one whit better by nature than those who are lost. Unsearchable are His judgments, His sentences of hardening and condemnation, as in the case of Pharaoh and that of the children of Israel during the centuries of testing, until, finally, the judgment of Is. 6 came upon them, significantly referred to in all four Gospels as well as in the last chapter of Acts. It is the mystery of the "same guilt" and of God's dealing with self-hardening. The very fact that God permits obstinate sinners to be caught in the meshes of their own opposition and enmity against Him and then turns their rejection by Him in favor of the vessels of His mercy exceeds our power of comprehension and leaves us in helpless bewilderment (v. 33 b).

II

A. Also in His works God is the Absolute One, whose sovereignty is one of justice as well as of grace and mercy (v. 35). No human being is in a position to boast of having

given anything to God, so that he may rightly expect something in return. Every notion held by men as though their goodness, their willingness to listen to the words of truth in the Word, or any other condition in themselves may cause God to regard them as worthy of His bounty is foolish from the outset. We have no right to demand anything from Him.

B. He has sovereign power with regard to His works (v. 36). He is the Creator of all things, for He brought forth the entire creation by the word of His divine power. He is the Preserver of all things (Acts 17:28). And according to His divine plan He is Himself the final goal of mankind, for He wants all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. His just judgments do no militate against the exercise of His loving-kindness and tender mercy upon His children. Augustine: "Thou hast created us unto Thee, and restless is our heart until it rests in Thee." Believers look forward to their final redemption with a heart that appreciates the promises of grace and is moved to accept them by the power of the Spirit through the Word. But with the fulfillment of our hopes in heaven will come the glorious eternal doxology (v. 36).

P. E. KRETMANN

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

1 JOHN 4:16-21

The Gospel for this Sunday pictures to us a man who lost the everlasting life which God meant also for him. He is not described as a criminal as was the impenitent thief on Calvary. Yet he was a great sinner, for in his life he showed love neither to God nor to his neighbor. The Gospel presents to us an earnest warning, for according to our corrupt nature we, too, are inclined to lead loveless lives. The Epistle exhorts us to

CHRISTIAN LOVE

I. Its source II. Its blessing III. Its manifestation

I

A. In the text St. John glorifies *Christian love*. 1) There is a natural love, often valuable and impressive, such as the heathen have (Rom. 2:14-15). Illustrate. Such love is worked by God through the Law written in man's heart, serves the

welfare of human society, and has the promise of this life (Fourth Commandment). 2) Christian love, however, is essentially different from natural love. a) It is found only in true believers in Christ (v. 16 a). Explain meaning of text. Examples: John the Evangelist, St. Paul, etc. b) It flows from God's own love toward us, experienced by us through faith in Christ (v. 19; John 15:19; Gal. 5:22; Eph. 5:2; 2 Tim. 1:7). The source of Christian love is God's own love manifested in our redemption (John 3:16; v. 16: "God is Love").

B. Have we that Christian love which should be ours as children of God in Christ Jesus? Where there is true faith, there also is true Christian love. Again, where there is no manifestation of Christian love, there is no true faith (Gal. 5:6; James 2:17 ff.). Remember, God demands love (Matt. 22:39; 1 Tim. 1:5; James 2:18; 1 Cor. 12:31; Col. 3:14; 1 Cor. 13:13; 16:14).

II

A. Blessed are all true Christians who live in Christian love. 1) They dwell in God, and God dwells in them (v. 16). Love of course is not a meritorious act, causing God to dwell in us, but God, being Love, cannot dwell in anyone who does not by faith manifest the fruit of faith — love (John 14:23 f.; 1 John 2:5). 2) They are without fear, for they shall not be judged. V. 17: True Christian love manifests its perfection in the boldness, the fearlessness, the true joy which believers have even when God's judgment comes upon the world, either now or at the end of the world (John 3:18; 1 Pet. 4:17; Acts 17:31; 24:15-16). Reason: As God is Love, so they walk in love (vv. 17 b-18). — True believers, living in love, do not fear, but eagerly await Christ's second coming (1 Cor. 1:7).

Have you the blessed assurance of God's indwelling in your soul? Do you live in loving communion with God? Have you the fearlessness, the boldness, the joy making you happy to receive the Lord whenever He should come? We of course cannot gain perfection in this life (Phil. 3:12). Nevertheless, that fearlessness is ours if by faith in Christ we walk in love. What an important point: if you are afraid of God, if you do not live in communion with God, beware! (2 Cor. 13:5).

III

A. But true love must manifest itself. 1) Toward God (v. 19; the first table of the Decalog), in keeping His commandments (John 14: 23). Stress this point in view of the gross neglect of this duty by so many Christians. 2) True Christian love manifests itself toward the neighbor (v. 20 f.; 1 John 3: 16 ff.; John 13: 34; Matt. 24: 12; John 13: 35; Rom. 13: 10; 1 Cor. 8: 1 ff.; 1 Cor. 13: 1 ff.; 2 Cor. 6: 6; Eph. 4: 2; 4: 15; Eph. 5: 2; Phil. 2: 2; Col. 2: 2; 1 Thess. 3: 12; 2 Thess. 1: 3; Heb. 10: 24; Rev. 2: 4; etc.). These passages show how serious God is in demanding of us true Christian love.

B. Have we such true love as manifests itself toward God and the neighbor? How greatly love is needed in the world and the Church! It is well that this Epistle should be considered at the very beginning of the Trinity Sunday series (Rom. 13: 10 b).

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER



Miscellanea

Notes on the Seventy Weeks in Daniel's Prophecy 9:24—27

The undersigned has been requested to write a brief article on the "Seventy Weeks" of Dan. 9:24—27 to be published in this periodical.

What prompts the writer to comply with the request submitted to him is largely a twofold caution. The one is that we do not permit ourselves to be drawn away from the center to the periphery, in other words, from the discussion of important doctrines and movements to such as are of minor significance, especially not to prophecies which at best can be explained only in a general way. Luther's dictum that the devil is always trying to mislead theologians, in the main, by two ways, first, by work-righteousness and, secondly, by inducing them to leave the essentials to discuss less important things in religion, deserves consideration also today. The second caution is that we must not make any passage a proof-text for some doctrine which manifestly is not a *sedes doctrinae*. Theologians may err by not fully evaluating passages which indeed are prooftexts, but there is danger, too, that they may be led to twist certain passages to prove things which actually they neither teach nor prove. This then becomes a case of *ἄτερ γραφῆς*, that is, of going beyond Scripture.

Now, with regard to Dan. 9:24—27 there is not a single explanation of this famous passage which solves every problem that it raises. That is not strange. In fact, that is true of many prophecies where the prediction must be applied to historical facts or phenomena. It is not necessary to go into detail on this point, since the matter is so very obvious. Fortunately, however, there are fundamentally two explanations of Dan. 9:24—27 which satisfy not only the analogy of faith, but also the majority of readers. It has been said that the Hebrew original of Dan. 9:24—27 is very difficult, but in the writer's estimation that is not the case. It is true, in v. 25 the traditional Hebrew text has a disturbing punctuation, but, after all, the punctuation of the Masora is not inspired, and Christian scholars are not bound to the traditions of the Masorites. The difficulty does not lie in the text, but in the application of the rather indefinite text to the time during which the predicted matters should occur.

One explanation regards the "seventy weeks" (v. 24) as a symbolical number, just as prophecy in many other cases deals with symbolical numbers. The *terminus ad quem* this explanation fixes as the perfection of the Kingdom of God, or the Church in its perfection, in other words, as the whole time from Daniel's prophecy to Judgment Day. The explanation divides this time into the following three periods: 1) The seven weeks (v. 25), or the

period from the building of the Temple to the coming of Christ; 2) the sixty-two weeks (this explanation observes the athnach, or semicolon, between the two sentences), or the period during which the New Testament Church will be built; 3) the one week, or the period during which the Antichrist will come who will cause the sacrifice to cease (cf. Dan. 7:7, 8) and who ushers in the final Judgment. The statement that the Antichrist will cause the sacrifice to cease in the midst of the week, suggests, as this explanation holds, that a change will take place (the Reformation), so that during the latter part of this last week his "abomination of desolation" will not be so great as it was during the first part.

To the writer it seems as if this explanation simplifies matters too greatly, while at the same time it does not recognize a number of important factors. In the first place, it ignores the fact that the prophetic information was granted Daniel upon his prayer for the restoration of the City of Jerusalem (v. 19 ff.). The reference of the prophecy is therefore properly to the building of the Holy City and the coming of the Messiah, and not to the entire New Testament era. Again, while the first period (according to this explanation) comprises only a short time (seven weeks), it does not seem quite clear why the period of the New Testament up to the coming of the Antichrist should be indicated in terms of sixty-two weeks and the period during which Antichrist reigns as only one week. Even if the seventy weeks are regarded as symbolical, the time proportion is hardly in keeping with the actual events as they have occurred in history. This explanation, moreover, translates "the most Holy" (v. 24) as neuter, referring it to the Temple, whereas in v. 25 "the most Holy" is explained as "the Messiah, the Prince." This is a minor point, but one, nevertheless, that should be considered. Finally, this explanation ignores Matt. 24:15 f., where Christ Himself describes the "abomination of desolation" as taking place in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. He tells the believers that when they behold the abomination of desolation prophesied by Daniel, they should flee into the mountains (v. 16). The same admonition of Christ is recorded, with some variation, in Mark 13:14. The Christians, as history reports, understood the Savior's warning very well, for when they saw the Roman army encircling the city, they fled. Anyone who has read the report given by Josephus can well understand why the horrors that came upon Jerusalem before and during its destruction, should be called the "abomination of desolation." So much regarding the first explanation.

The second explanation is the most ancient and also the most popular. With more or less justification, it regards the "seventy weeks" as "weeks of years" ("Jahrwochen"), comprising, roughly speaking, a period of four hundred and ninety years. According to this explanation, the first period, or the seven weeks, includes the whole time when the city was rebuilt and its walls were completed, in other words, the whole period of Nehemiah's administration, extending through forty-nine years. The second period, com-

prising sixty-two years, embraces the entire time from the rebuilding of the city to the Messiah's coming and death. In short, from the time of the beginning of the rebuilding of the Temple to the Messiah there will be sixty-nine (seven and sixty-two) weeks of years. The question is: How shall we arrive at these 483 years? There are various ways of computing this time, but essentially they are the same.

The first command to rebuild the Temple was given by Cyrus in 536 B. C. (cf. Ezra 1:2; 6:1-12). However, the work of rebuilding the city walls was not begun until Artaxerxes issued a special decree to this effect in the year 453 (or 454) B. C. (cf. Neh. 2:4-8). Add to this the thirty years until the anointing of the Messiah, and you will have the sixty-nine weeks or 483 years. If, with others, we reckon from the year 449 B. C., this brings us to A. D. 34 or about the time of Christ's death. This is as close as we can hope to come, since neither the time of Artaxerxes' decree nor that of our Lord's birth and Baptism is exactly settled. That is essentially the explanation of Luther (cf. St. L. Ed., VI:906 ff.), who warns his readers that in computing the time one must not be too exacting, but be satisfied with a general computation. Luther's explanation is followed by the exegetes who prepared the so-called *Weimarer Bibel*. It is also set forth with some detail in the *Concordia Bible with Notes*, which Concordia Publishing House hopes to put on the market this year.

According to this second explanation, v. 24 roughly predicts the entire time from the rebuilding of the city walls under Nehemiah until the Messiah will come and finish His redemptive work. In v. 25 the prophecy divides sixty-nine weeks of this time into two periods, one covering that of Nehemiah's administration and the other that of the coming and anointing of the Messiah. In v. 26 the prophecy foretells that after these sixty-nine years the Messiah will be crucified, and in close connection with this criminal act it predicts the destruction of the ungodly city. V. 27 then foretells that though the city will be destroyed, the Messiah's work will not have been in vain; for He will confirm the covenant (of grace which was ratified by His death) with many. In other words, in Jerusalem many will be saved through faith in the Messiah, before the destroyer will come who with the overspreading of abominations will make it desolate (cf. Matt. 25:15 ff.).

The difficulty in this verse lies in the "one week" which is granted for the confirming of the Messiah's covenant. There are many who believe that all v. 27 means to say is that this preaching of grace will take place in the last of the "Seventy Weeks" or in the seventieth week. This explanation is justified in view of the fact that Christ is said to have been raised after three days, though actually He was dead only a part of that time, since He died on Friday evening and was raised early the next Sunday morning. Biblical reckoning, just as Oriental reckoning in general, is not always as accurate as is our modern Western timekeeping.

Luther seems to regard this last week, or seven years, literally. He says that the first seven years after Christ's ascension were the true "Easter week" during which the Gospel was preached at Jerusalem and many mighty miracles were performed to confirm it. The words of v. 27 that the sacrifice will cease in the midst of the week, he refers to the abrogation of the ceremonial laws in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 15:6 ff.). The end of the last week marks the hardening of the unbelieving Jews at Jerusalem so that the Apostles now turned to the Gentiles (cf. Acts 13:46). While the dates of many events even in the New Testament are not exactly settled, we know that the persecution of the Christian Church at Jerusalem began very early and Luther may be right in saying that the hardening of the Jews set in at the end of the seventieth week, or seven years after the Savior's ascension. With the rejection of Christ as the Messiah the millennialistic movement among the Jews grew stronger and stronger, and this finally brought about Rome's destruction of Jerusalem.

The explanation just described, while it presents a number of difficulties, is in keeping with Matt. 24:15-16, and was so understood by the Christians at Jerusalem, who fled when they saw the eagles of the Roman standards, regarded as objects of idolatrous worship, encamped about Jerusalem. But let no one say that this or that explanation of the important prophecy, made about five hundred years before the destruction of Jerusalem, is the only correct one. Personally the writer prefers the second. Nevertheless let us bear in mind that the destruction of Jerusalem will forever stand as the symbol of the world's destruction and that the many antichrists in Jerusalem foreshadowed the coming of the great Antichrist, of whom St. Paul speaks in 2 Thess. 2. Only when we speak of that Antichrist, let us use the *sedes doctrinae* which teach the doctrine clearly and unmistakably.*

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

A Glimpse of Church Conditions in Germany

In *America* (Roman Catholic weekly) for September 8, 1945, Rev. Henry Klein, S. J., speaks of conditions under which he worked during the war, and is working at present, as pastor of St. Clemens Church in Berlin. While the article is written from the Roman Catholic point of view, it is informative, and all of us who are interested in the future of the Christian Church in Germany will be glad to read it. We print the greater part of the article. Having spoken of Gestapo activities against Catholic priests, the writer continues:

"This took place in June, 1941. I myself had just been discharged from the Army, in which I had served for a year and a half as Army Chaplain and from which I was removed, as were all other Jesuits, for being politically unreliable. While my

* In *Lehre und Wehre* this material was treated in articles that appeared in Vol. 31, Nos. 7 and 8 (1885) and Vol. 32, No. 12 (1886).

predecessors were in prison, I took charge of the services at Saint Clemens and was determined to entrench myself in one corner of the church building, now occupied by the Gestapo, until the day should come on which I could once more take over the rightful property of the church. For four years one of the Chaplains and I actually lived in two rooms close to the church—rooms that were so dark they called for artificial lighting during the entire day.

"At first many of the Catholics no longer attended church for fear of the Gestapo, who, from their windows, could observe every churchgoer. Gradually, however, the congregation came in increasing numbers, happy in this way to demonstrate against the Nazis. Meanwhile the Bishop of Muenster, Count von Galen, and the Bishop of Berlin, Count von Preysing, had protested vehemently in public against Nazi infringements. Saint Clemens was the first church in the whole of Germany that had been expropriated by the Nazis and for which the Nazis subsequently wanted to exact an annual rent of twelve thousand marks from the parish.

"The firm attitude adopted by the Bishop of Muenster in July and August, 1941, towards the Hitler regime led to a change of Nazi policy towards the Church. The most radical among the Nazis, who, notwithstanding the war, wanted an open break with the Church, demanded that the Bishop of Muenster be immediately hanged and that further measures be adopted against the Church. They were, however, admonished by Hitler—on Goebbels' advice—to moderate themselves, since it was feared that opposition on the part of the Bishops would grow to an ever greater extent if measures antagonistic to the Church were adopted. The Bishops were now readily listened to by the people, and things did not look so well for the Nazis in 1941 as they had in 1939. Nazi policy was now more dependent upon public opinion than it had been formerly. Hitler, therefore, decided to act during the war as though the Nazis were collaborating loyally with the Church. He promised, however, to hand over the entire property of the Church to the German people for social welfare after the war. In the delirium of victory it would be child's play, he thought, to carry out these plans and to take revenge on the Church.

"Thus it came about that the Gestapo was compelled to accept my stay in this impossible vicinity and that one fine day the Church came into its own again. The Gestapo, it is true, made efforts to have me removed by 'legal methods.' I was sent to prison for several weeks, and meanwhile they tried to collect material against me. Though my rooms were repeatedly searched, nothing of an incriminating nature was found, and I was thereupon released from prison.

"In March, 1943, following a very bad air raid, the Nazis once again tried to close Saint Clemens on another 'legal' basis. They converted the church into a storeroom in which furniture from damaged houses was stored, a measure which on the surface would seem to be one adopted for public welfare. We protested, however,

by drawing public attention to the hypocritical manner in which the Nazis deplored the damage done to churches by air raids while at the same time they made storerooms of those that had not been destroyed. Our protests were not in vain, for every bit of furniture was removed overnight. We knew the Nazis would not forget this, but at the same time we were convinced that we had the better chance of surviving the war.

"I admit, however, that I had hoped that the day of liberation from the Nazis would be somewhat different from what it eventually was. The number of souls in my parish dropped from four thousand to five hundred. The church was severely damaged by shells; the interior was plundered, the priestly vestments torn or ruined. Fighting and looting around the church continued for days. The church buildings, or what is left of them, are once more in our hands, yet so far there is no sign of new life in or around them. They are now filled with the homeless and the many fugitives who are being driven out of Silesia and Bohemia and do not know where to go. Among them are German soldiers returning home, tired, hungry, demoralized, in search of their wives and children — men who were once the pride of the nation have now to beg for bread and shelter, since their country could do nothing to prepare for their return. Catholic societies have not yet been re-established nor have Catholic schools so far received permission to re-open, though children are already attending other schools."

A.

The Common Cup and the Danger of Infection

In the *Living Church* of September 2, 1945, an editorial appeared having the title "The Common Chalice." From the remarks made there it is evident that in the Protestant Episcopal Church the subject of the common cup is much discussed. We reprint the section which concerns itself with the health angle of the subject.

"A letter in this week's correspondence columns discusses further the famous Burrows and Hemmens report on the bactericidal properties of the silver chalice, pointing out that these properties are ineffectual against the germ which causes tuberculosis. The writer, Dr. Joseph H. Pratt, is a distinguished physician and churchman of Boston.

"Dr. Pratt's letter forces us to go into a discussion of medical matters which will, we know, be distasteful to many readers. Investigating the pathological possibilities of the Blessed Sacrament is certainly not a spiritually rewarding activity. To those who are confident that the Sacrament is not to be seriously considered as a source of infection, we say that we believe their confidence well founded, and suggest that they skip the rest of this editorial. Those who have doubts about the matter may find them relieved by a careful consideration of the supposed hazards.

"The first fact that the medical layman has to absorb in any consideration of disease is that absolute freedom from germs is

(at least in the present stage of human development) impossible in a room containing a human being. A surgeon about to operate washes his hands thoroughly with a very efficient disinfectant. But all he has to do is twiddle his fingers and they are again well populated with bacteria. Any contact between human beings exposes each to whatever the other may have. Handshaking, conversation, singing, laughter, passing Prayer Books back and forth, using money (especially paper money) — these are only a few of the thousands of possible ways of spreading disease which beset human beings every minute of every day.

"The Burrows and Hemmens report concluded, after a most careful and exhaustive study of the evidence, that the silver chalice was a considerably less dangerous source of infection than many others which human beings face with equanimity every day. Dr. Pratt, in reply, asserts that the tuberculosis germ is not killed by the self-sterilizing action of the chalice. (Incidentally, his reference to 'ten minutes' with reference to streptococci does not mean, as one might think who had not studied the report, that the chalice is a dangerous source of such infection for ten minutes.) The question is, does the hardiness of the tuberculosis germ refute the report's assertion that the chalice is not to be seriously considered as a source of infection?

"Burrows and Hemmens obviously thought not, or they would have included this warning in their summary. The explanation, we think, is to be found in the character of the disease.

"The tubercle bacillus surrounds itself with a tough coating which protects it from many germicides, including silver ions. Yet the disease is not an epidemic one; people are not as a rule seriously affected with it unless they have repeated contact with a source of infection.

"Coughing, laughing, talking, and singing are also effective ways of spreading tuberculosis. In fact, 'spray infection' by one of these means is probably the commonest cause. If a tuberculous person is a choir singer, the other members of the choir are in definite danger of infection — a danger which is not greatly increased by the use of a common chalice in the Holy Communion.

"Fortunately, there is a simple and positive test to show whether a person has been infected by tuberculosis — the well-known tuberculin test. It is to be hoped that before very long everyone will take this test once a year. If it proves positive, further examination will show whether the subject actually has the disease at the present time. There is little reason for a case of tuberculosis to remain undetected under modern medical practice.

"A first infection with tuberculosis, furthermore, is seldom serious. The bacillus does not ordinarily lodge in the porous tissue of the lungs until the body has developed the habit of resisting it because of a previous infection in some less vital spot." — A.

Theological Observer

Summer School for Pastors at Seward, June 24—July 12.—Concordia Teachers College of Seward, Nebr., again plans to conduct a summer school for pastors in connection with its regular summer school for 1946. This summer school for pastors will be operated under the auspices of the seminary of St. Louis.

Among the courses particularly designed to interest and benefit pastors are the following: 1. "The Church"; 2. "Readings in the Greek New Testament"; 3. "The Church in Public Relations"; 4. "Audio-Visual Aids"; 5. "Psychology of Adolescence"; 6. "Rural Sociology"; 7. "Hymnology."

The course in "The Church" will follow the seminar technique. Prof. Wm. Arndt, D.D., the chairman of Synod's Committee of Doctrinal Unity, will be the discussion leader. The group will examine the Scriptural doctrine and the use to which this doctrine must be put in the faith and life of the Church today. President A. O. Fuerbringer will assign reports and study by individual members.

Dr. Arndt will also teach a rapid reading course in the Greek New Testament, coupling it with an attempt to examine and evaluate the recent Revised Standard Version of the New Testament.

In the course on "The Church in Public Relations" Doctor L. G. Bickel will lead in the discussion of the theory and practice of getting publicity for the local congregation, its school, and other agencies in various publicity media.

Prof. C. T. Brandhorst will teach the course in "Audio-Visual Education" aids and relationship to the missionary and educational work of the Church.

In the course on "Psychology of Adolescence," to be taught by Dr. Theo. G. Stelzer, especial study will be given to the critical adolescent period in the life of young people.

The course in "Rural Sociology" will contain a unit which will examine the interrelationship of the congregation and the rural community.

Prof. Paul Reuter, in the course in "Hymnology," will study and portray the great hymns, hymn leaders, and church musicians which have combined to build up the musical treasury of the Christian Church.

In addition, pastors on the campus during those three weeks will be privileged to audit other courses in the regular summer school curriculum in whose content they are interested.

Congregations are urged to make it possible for their pastors to attend and, if necessary, to grant them special assistance for the purpose of enabling them to attend.

For definite information in regard to costs and conditions of admission, please communicate with

CONCORDIA TEACHERS COLLEGE, SEWARD, NEBR.

A. O. FUERBRINGER, President

The Relations Between the A. L. C. and the U. L. C. A. — The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* for January, 1946, publishes a frank address by the Honorable Edward Rinderknecht, a distinguished lawyer of Toledo, Ohio, and a member of the U. L. C. A. Commission on Relations to American Lutheran Church Bodies, on the topic "Lutheran Unity and Union from the Point of View of the U. L. C." The occasion when the address was delivered is not mentioned; but the manner of presentation leads one to believe that members of the American Lutheran Church were present. In our opinion the address is important and should be studied by all who desire to understand the situation that obtains in the Lutheran camp here in America. For the benefit of those who are not able to procure a copy of this issue of the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* we shall endeavor to give the gist of Mr. Rinderknecht's remarks.

The U. L. C. A. has from the very start (1918) desired to be united with the other Lutheran bodies of our country. After, at conventions and other meetings, the belief had often been expressed that the Lutherans of America should join hands, the U. L. C. A. at its convention in Savannah, 1934, in response to memorials from eight of its constituent synods, decided to invite the other Lutheran bodies of America to confer with it for the establishment "of closer relationships and organic union," and authorized the appointment of a commission to carry on the required negotiations. Soon a meeting was held between the commissions of the U. L. C. A. and that of the A. L. C. The latter stated that it was not appointed for the establishment of organic union, but to bring about fellowship. Although disappointed, the U. L. C. A. representatives agreed to enter upon a discussion of that topic. They were told by the A. L. C. commission that to reach the goal of fellowship it would be necessary to agree on the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures and two practical questions, those of unionism and lodge membership. After negotiations that lasted more than three years, the Pittsburgh Agreement was drawn up and accepted by both commissions. The U. L. C. A. at its meeting in Omaha, 1940, endorsed this Agreement [though not unanimously. A.]; the A. L. C. convention, meeting simultaneously at Detroit, while adopting the Pittsburgh Agreement, stated that circumstances did not make it possible as yet to enter into pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A.

In 1942 the two conventions again met at almost the same time, the A. L. C. at Mendota, Ill., adjourning when the U. L. C. A. at Louisville, Ky., was opening its sessions. The U. L. C. A. understood certain resolutions of the A. L. C. to mean that the latter had resolved to establish pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A., and it adopted some enthusiastic resolutions of joy. But nothing happened. "Later we learned that Dr. Reu had voiced the opinion that the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A. would constitute unionism and that the U. L. C. A. must

have misunderstood the Mendota resolutions. At its last convention [Sandusky, 1944] the A. L. C. is reported to have taken the position that "altar and pulpit fellowship is a matter of local concern." (This is a reference to the selective fellowship question. The author is in error. The A. L. C. asked its members to study this matter. A.) "So after ten years of negotiations the two church bodies are not further than they were at the beginning."

Suggestions that meetings with the commissions of other Lutheran bodies should be arranged were received by the U. L. C. A. commission during the last two years. Since these proposed meetings were to concern themselves with discussions of doctrine and perhaps the formulation of new statements, the suggestions were not acted on favorably. "We do not believe that the way to unite our churches or to bring about greater unity or their co-operation is through the adoption of joint statements on questions of doctrine and practice." The U. L. C. A. has issued its Baltimore Declaration on the inspiration of the Scriptures and its Washington Declaration, stating its position on unionism and lodge membership. It subscribes to the historic Confessions of the Lutheran Church, especially the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, and believes that no further tests should be imposed or required.

While there is a good deal of co-operation between the synods, especially through the National Lutheran Council, it must be recognized that the Council is merely "an agency of the participating bodies." "It is not tantamount to, or even a good substitute for, a united Church." With respect to unity and union the U. L. C. A. desires to establish union at once, the A. L. C. thinks that unity must first be attained. The U. L. C. A. believes there is enough unity at present; the A. L. C. disagrees. The U. L. C. A. thinks that through union the desired unity would be promoted "Let us unite our churches, and unity will take care of itself." The A. L. C. seems to expect the U. L. C. A. to come over to its position; but in such matters the "give and take" policy must be followed. The U. L. C. A. is willing to take the A. L. C. as it is; but if its Lutheranism is questioned by the A. L. C., "we might tell them that they are just a little too legalistic, that there is more than a trace of Calvinism in their thinking and practice, and that they seem to have forgotten one of the fundamental tenets of Lutheranism, the right of private judgment."

The A. L. C. itself lacks the unity it demands from the U. L. C. A. It frowns on the membership held by the U. L. C. A. pastors in the local councils of churches, but some of its own clergymen are prominent in the work and administration of such councils. It does not permit its pastors to belong to lodges, but neither does it discipline its own laymen who have strayed into such organizations. It would be as easy for the A. L. C. to discipline laymen that are in the lodges as it would be for the U. L. C. A. to discipline ministers for lodge membership.

The approach to the whole question is different with U. L. C. A. men from that of members of the A. L. C., the former dwelling on the advantages that would accrue through union, the latter on the obstacles that are in the way. "Does it not really appear that the A. L. C. is demanding greater unity from us than it possesses? With what position are we asked to come into unity with the A. L. C. on unionism — with the position of Dr. Hein and Dr. Reu or with the position of Dr. Michelfelder [at one time president of the Toledo Council of Churches]? On the lodge question, are we going to attain unity on the position of the Missouri Synod or on that of the U. L. C. A.? or are both expected to come over to the A. L. C. position? The A. L. C. method of uniting the Church has been tried for ten years. It has not worked. Let the U. L. C. A. method be tried now. Uniting will mean that the Lutheran Church can take its proper place among the churches of America and enjoy the prestige to which it is entitled. American Lutheranism must prepare itself to take the leadership of Lutheranism throughout the world." Does the world situation not call for a uniting of our forces? —

We have endeavored to summarize fairly the views and arguments of Mr. Rinderknecht, whom personally we hold in high esteem. Our intention is not to write a long criticism of his position; we summarized his remarks for the information they contain. But one or two things should be said. Certain districts of the A. L. C. are valiantly fighting the lodge evil; others are delinquent in this respect. We wish very much that all the A. L. C. and U. L. C. A. men would earnestly study the lodge resolutions of the Missouri Synod. Through unbiased study it would become apparent, we are convinced, that these resolutions are in full keeping with the Scriptures and the Confessions of the Church. With respect to unionism, let the paragraphs of the Brief Statement and the Doctrinal Affirmation on fellowship with the heterodox be carefully examined. We have not seen any solid argument advanced showing that the conservative position taken there is wrong. Concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures, the point of controversy has to do with the question whether the Scriptures are inerrant in everything they say. That is a far more vital question than might at first appear to be the case. If the Scriptures are made unreliable, what foundation is there left for us? May the remarks of Mr. Rinderknecht lead to a prayerful study of the great questions involved in the subject on which he spoke. A.

The Business of the Church. — In the issue of March 17 the *Northwestern Lutheran* submits an editorial written by one of the editors, the Rev. W. J. Schaefer, in which the question is discussed, Where does the Church stand? On account of the importance which attaches to this subject at the present time when the Church is faulted for not concerning itself more with social questions, we herewith reprint this editorial.

"Where does the Church stand? That is the question that

is making the rounds with regard to the Labor Union question. The question indicates that many believe that the Church ought to take sides in the matter. At a meeting of ministers in Milwaukee one speaker is quoted as having said: 'The Church must take cognizance of the labor movement if, at the end, the Church does not want to lose out.' It is also reported that in the ranks of marching strikers at General Electric eleven Protestant ministers were identified. Said one of them: 'Failure to take sides in labor matters has resulted in a decline of the influence that the Church has today in regard to moral issues.' We wonder if these men are serious or if they say these things just to have something to talk about. They ought to know the Church's function better than that. They ought to know so much about the Church at least that it is clear to them that the Church recognizes no 'movements.' The Church is above all 'movements' and earthly issues. That does not mean that the Church does not sympathize with men who suffer under unjust conditions in life, whatever they may be; but it does mean that the Church does not try to reduce these conditions by becoming a party to the movement. The Church in her place will continue to 'preach the Word; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine,' as the Lord would have her to do and instructs her to do (2 Tim. 4:2). That is, the Church is to deal only with those who belong to her membership. She has no obligation to those 'who are without' but to call them to repentance. So the Lord would have it. The Church has been commissioned by the Lord Jesus to preach repentance and salvation to lost and condemned sinners. This and no more is the work of the Church. The Church is not obligated to police the world and enter upon the 'moral issues' that pertain to the world and are purely earthly. The Church is not 'to make this world a better place to live in.' The Church is rather to accept the conditions as they are, whether adjudged good or bad by men, and under such conditions preach the Word of the Gospel and salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ. If, as it has often happened, the preaching or acceptance of the Gospel also changes living conditions, that is well and good, and the Church will rejoice. But if these conditions are not affected and yet sinners confess the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior, the Church still rejoices over the one great fact that God is able to save men under all conditions of life and that the success of the preaching of the Gospel is not dependent on man-made conditions. These will neither enhance nor hinder the power of the Gospel. That is the business of the Church and the Church's place in the world. The Church is verily in the world but not of the world and does not mess with the things that pertain to this world. "Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4). That was Christ's attitude when a man came to Him and asked Him to adjust an inheritance problem: 'Man, who made Me a judge or divider over you?' (Luke 12:14.) That is where the Church stands in all

things that pertain to the conditions of this life. Christian men will expect no more of the Church."

These are much-needed words. The statement "The Church is not obligated to . . . enter upon the 'moral issues' that pertain to the world" may be misunderstood. If the Word of God has anything to say on these issues, it certainly is the duty of the Church to preach it. We take it that the editor refers to the political persons who preach their own wisdom rather than the eternal Word.

A.

Augustana's "Grand Old Man."—The *Lutheran Companion* (March 20, 1946) reports that Dr. E. F. Bartholomew on March 24 celebrated his one-hundredth anniversary, he having been born on March 24, 1846, in Sunbury, Pa. Several arresting articles are dedicated to his life and work in the issue of the *Companion* mentioned above. His was indeed a rare distinction in many ways. His entire teaching career covered a period of sixty-one years, interrupted only by a year of study at the University of Berlin in 1894. At the age of ninety-eight years he conducted chapel exercises at Augustana College, and at ninety-seven he delivered a sermon on Good Friday in Rock Island, Ill. An article written by him and an interview with him, both published in the *Companion*, contain many quotable statements. His only formula for achieving longevity was, next to the grace of God, "work and temperate living." "I have avoided all extremes," he said in reply to the question put to him. In his fine article "What Are We Here For?" he says, among other things: "We are here to do what we can for the spread of the Gospel to the ends of the globe. The Gospel summarizes the Word of Christ, which is the power of life. His Word is very truth, the voice of God, 'Thus saith the Lord.'" At the close of the article there occurs this fine statement: "As I realize that my end must be drawing near, I appreciate the more what Christ means to me. My eternal hope rests in Him alone." Very true is also this statement of his: "The custom, which prevails among school boards and operators, of retiring teachers when they have reached a certain age is all wrong. The longer a teacher has pursued his calling, the better he is qualified for that office. If he is physically strong and mentally sound, he should not be retired just because he is old. The determining consideration should be not age but mental condition and physical ability. There are here in Augustana College some teachers who have been retired because they have reached the age limit, but the fact is that they are better qualified to teach than ever before. Ability to serve and not age should determine their continuance in office." To Dr. Bartholomew hearty congratulations!

J. T. M.

Luther's Position Concerning the Scriptures.—On this question Prof. C. G. Carlfelt submits a paragraph or two in an article that is well worth reading, entitled "The Reformation Heritage," published in the January, 1946, number of the *Augustana Quarterly* (Vol. XXV, No. 1). This number, by the way, contains several

articles dealing with Luther, for which we are grateful. The paragraphs of Professor Carlfelt in which he speaks of Luther's attitude toward the inspiration of the Scriptures should be looked at carefully. We are here dealing with a historical question. In our opinion Dr. Reu settled all doubts that people might entertain as to the question whether Luther taught the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Let Professor Carlfelt's remarks be studied from that point of view.

"Luther was what we might call a 'Bible theologian' in that he drew his insight and his inspiration from the Scriptures. The Word was his authority in all matters of faith and life. He accepted it as a message from God to man. Yet Luther also exhibits a spirit of Christian liberty in his approach to the Scriptures. He is not bound by any man-made theory of inspiration, and it is of little concern to him who the author of this or that book might have been. What matters to him is that in that Word God speaks and through it Christ is brought to sinners who need salvation. He also knows that no theory, be it ever so finely woven, and no 'proofs,' however logical they might be, can establish the authority of the Word. When the Holy Spirit applies the Word to the human heart, then this Word needs no other authorization than its own intrinsic character and nature as a message from God.

"In this connection we might remind ourselves of Luther's joy in finding the Bible and his absorbing interest in that Book. From the first to the last he was a tireless student of the Word. Had it not been for his zeal and industry in this field, the character of the Reformation movement might have been far different from what it now is. Luther was bound in the eternal truth which he had found in Scripture, and having once found the truth, there could be no compromise. His industrious searching of the Word and his loyalty to the truth he there discovered are noteworthy parts of the heritage he has left for us."

A.

Federal Council Meeting in Columbus, Ohio.—Early in March the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America met for three days in Columbus, Ohio. Five hundred representatives of the twenty-one denominations which are associated in this council had gathered to deliberate on the work that the Council endeavors to do. One of the high spots of the meeting was a visit and address by President Truman. A report in the *Christian Century* by its associate editor Harold E. Fey says that "The most controversial document to come before this meeting was a report of the Calhoun Commission on 'Atomic Warfare and the Christian Faith.'" The report of this commission was signed by 22 theologians, which stated that "it held that our course in using the atomic bomb was 'inexcusable,' 'irresponsible,' and 'morally indefensible,' and declared that 'we have sinned grievously against the laws of God and against the people of Japan.' It condemned obliteration bombing and voiced the view that 'the only method by which the new weapons can be controlled is through the prevention of war.'"

The signers of this report represented nine denominations and several schools of thought. They favored the establishment of world government, but held it is impracticable now. They urge the Church to enlarge its ministry of reconciliation so that the U. N. O. can do the work it was designed to do. After some debate this report was referred "without instructions" to the executive committee of the Federal Council.

The 500 delegates were divided into five sections, which studied, respectively, the topics of evangelism, community donations, returning servicemen and servicewomen, foreign relief, and world order. On recommendation of the section discussing world order, the conference "asked the United States to admit the principle of trusteeship concerning all the former Japanese mandated islands we have occupied. It sought to get the U. N. O. to speed up processes of self-determination for dependent peoples and urged that body promptly to open its membership to neutrals and to former enemy states. It asked Congress to give economic aid to nations in distress, so that the world economy can again function, and particularly stressed the importance of the proposed credit to Great Britain. It asked for codification of international law. The American Government was urged to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in legal disputes between ourselves and other nations." With respect to territorial changes, the conference urged that the wishes of the inhabitants must be respected and colonial peoples should be assured their freedom. "It opposed reparations that cut down living standards, denounced the enslavement of whole peoples, and deplored mass evacuation of populations. It said that Christians in this situation can and must call on the 'boundless resources of God' to make them agents for brotherhood, freedom, and justice." With respect to race relations, segregation of the races was severely criticized and denounced. The labor situation was looked at, and labor's right to strike was reaffirmed. It was advocated that a Christian university "of highest postgraduate rank" be built in Japan.

It was proposed furthermore that the three Protestant organizations for foreign relief, the World Council Service, the Church Committee for Overseas Relief and Reconstruction, and the Committee for Relief in Asia, be merged. The churches were asked to raise fifty million dollars for overseas relief in addition to what they have contributed till now for this purpose.—

As one views this report, it becomes very evident that the Federal Council of Churches concerns itself very much with matters that are political or belong to the sphere of diplomacy and statesmanship. In our opinion this aspect of the endeavors of the Council involves complete oblivion of the great statement of Jesus that His kingdom is not of this world. A.

Relief for Famine Sufferers in Germany.—When, about the 1st of May, these lines will reach our readers, the information they contain will be old and not of immediate value any more.

But for the sake of posterity, we think mention should be made on these pages of developments in the field of relief for Central Europe.

On Feb. 19 an announcement of President Truman stated that the Government resolved to grant permission to certain non-governmental agencies for the furnishing of aid to the hungry people in the zone of Germany occupied by the American military forces. The number of these agencies which were enumerated in the statement was eleven. Among them is Lutheran World Relief, Inc., through which our Synod, with other Lutheran bodies, is endeavoring to do its work. The agencies had to establish a council through which the details involved in this stupendous task are attended to, and the title of this council is: Council of Relief Agencies Licensed for Operation in Germany (CRALOG).

Contrary to isolated reports which denied the existence of a desperate situation in Germany, conditions in that harassed country are now recognized to be indescribably sad. The British people, who have nobly attempted to provide food for the famished multitudes in their sphere of occupation, found it necessary to announce a serious decrease in the rations that would be handed out. Our own authorities were afraid that the amount of food they were dispensing, averaging 1,500 calories per day for a person, would likewise, on account of lack of supplies, have to be reduced considerably. In the French zone of occupation it was found no more food could be distributed after March 10 unless a serious cut were introduced; to avoid the complete cessation of aid, the daily ration was reduced from 1350 to 1075 calories. Owing to the gravity of the outlook, a Famine Emergency Committee, of which former President Hoover is honorary chairman, was formed in Washington. Mr. Hoover states that rice and wheat crops through unfavorable weather conditions were damaged enormously and that instead of twenty million tons of wheat, which are the minimum requirement for the population of the globe, only fifteen million are available. Accordingly the appeal has gone out that we Americans, who are living in a land of plenty, should be more frugal in the consumption of wheat products in order that more grain can be sent abroad. How Mr. Hoover views conditions his words indicate: "The fate of civilization depends on whether the American people are willing to make a sacrifice for the next four months, if they are willing to save the world from chaos." The term "the next four months" is employed because it is held that the tragic shortage of supplies will last till the next harvest has been gathered.

Wherever God's children hear of these conditions, their hearts bleed and are eager to furnish aid. Let the Christians be told, and let the opportunities for furnishing assistance be provided. This is the responsibility of the authorities in Church and State. A.

The "Living Church" on the Relations Between the Federal Council and the Protestant Episcopal Church.—In the *Living Church* of March 17 an editorial is found in which the membership

of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Federal Council is discussed. To acquaint our readers with the argumentation of those who favor membership in the Federal Council, we herewith reprint the editorial.

"We should like to add just a word about the membership of the Episcopal Church in the Federal Council.

"For many years, the *Living Church* opposed membership of this Church in the Federal Council. In its earlier years the Federal Council manifested a strong tendency toward a militant pan-Protestantism, with emphasis upon such policies as national prohibition, community churches, and a kind of 'comity' in which it was tacitly assumed that Christian unity could be achieved on a least-common-multiple basis. In such an organization, the Episcopal Church obviously had no proper place.

"But the Federal Council grew in wisdom and stature. It began to catch more of an ecumenical vision. It recognized a distinction between doctrinal matters, with which it is not concerned, and matters of common action on universal Christian principles, in which it is concerned.

"Six years ago the Episcopal Church decided to accept full membership in the Federal Council. Since that time Churchmen have played an important part in the activities of the Council, and the Church has been represented at every meeting by delegates representing all schools of thought within the Church. Anglo-Catholics as well as Liberals and Evangelicals have taken part in the sessions of the Council and served on its commissions and committees. Our Presiding Bishop served a term as president of the Council.

"The result has been beneficial both for the Church and for the Federal Council. The Church has been enabled to pool its efforts with those of other Christian communions in matters in which a common front is greatly to be preferred to a series of unrelated efforts. The Federal Council, through the membership of the Episcopal Church and some of the Orthodox churches, has become more than a pan-Protestant organization, and something closer to the effective agency through which the non-Roman churches of America can bring their united strength to bear in practical matters on which they are substantially in agreement.

"Occasionally — as in the opening address of Bishop Oxnam at Columbus — the Churchmen's ear is offended by a note of pan-Protestantism, in apparent conflict with the Catholic values that the Church treasures; but usually such a note is unthinking, and any offense that it gives is unintentional. It is significant that on the very next day, in introducing President Truman, Bishop Oxnam took care to indicate that Orthodox and Anglo-Catholics, as well as Protestants, were members of the Federal Council and parties to its deliberations.

"We believe that every Churchman who has served as a delegate to the Federal Council, including the most 'advanced' Anglo-

Catholic, will agree that our membership in that body has been more than justified, and that we should continue in the future to co-operate with it as fully as possible."

The *Living Church* apparently is not worried by the unscriptural, anti-Christian theology of many prominent representatives and large groups in the Federal Council. Of course, a cross section of its own denomination would very much resemble the cross section of the Federal Council of Churches, all shades of religious opinion being represented.

A.

The Method of Electing Bishops in England.—Under the heading "The Episcopate in England," the *Living Church* submits this interesting and informative editorial.

"A recent article in the London *Church Times* raises the whole question of the selection of bishops in the Church of England. In typical British journalistic style it is headlined 'The Appointment of Bishops,' with the sub-head 'Farcical Elections,' and is attributed to 'a Proctor in Convocation.' Pointing out that there were three vacant bishoprics at the time, and it was therefore an opportune occasion for considering the procedure adopted in the appointment of bishops, the writer observed:

"The whole subject bristles with anomalies. The Church officially has no share in the appointment of its chief pastors. The chapters, upon receiving the *congé d' élire*, go through an empty ceremony of "election," which can only be described as farcical. As a rule, the appointment is published in the press before the "election" takes place, and indeed before the chapters have any official knowledge of the nomination."

"It is certainly difficult to understand how or why our English fellow Churchmen put up with such a situation. In practice, the English bishops are chosen by the Prime Minister (who may not even be a Churchman, as in the case of Lloyd George, MacDonald, and Chamberlain), just as autocratically as Nazi *gauleiters* were chosen—and the ratifying election is no more free than was one under the Hitler regime. Indeed, British law provides severe personal penalties including, we believe, confiscation of all their real and personal property as well as their clerical stipends for members of any chapter that might refuse to elect the government's choice.

"Seven hundred years ago *Magna Carta* in ringing terms proclaimed: 'The Church of England shall be free!' The point at issue was this very one—the right of chapters to elect bishops without interference by King or Pope. But the interference continued through the ages, even after the Statutes of Provisors and *Praemunire* in the 14th century itself was accompanied by a law of 1534 requiring chapters to elect the royal nominee.

"It would be interesting to see what would happen if an English chapter had the courage to appeal from the law of 1534 to the Great Charter of 1215, and the even greater charter of Our Lord's Divine Commission, by ignoring the King's nominee for

a vacant bishopric and choosing its own candidate. The members of the chapter might go to jail for a while, but they would take a long step forward in reasserting the freedom of the English Church. And they would also be bringing the Church of England closer to its daughter churches of the Anglican communion, which are happily free of any such entangling alliance with the State."

A.

The Mind of Ignatius Loyola. A Study in the Psychopathology of Religion.—Under this heading, Carl J. Schindler in the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* (January, 1946, p. 83 ff.) publishes an interesting analysis of the minds of Luther and Loyola. Luther's ninety-five theses were written in 1517; the "Spiritual Exercises" of Ignatius Loyola in 1522. But while Luther found "his way through the underbrush of medieval theology, mysticism, folklore and pious practices to the clear springs of the biblical religion," and while he showed an "essential health-mindedness by his unfailing ability to distinguish between wholesome and morbid types of Christian religion," he reaches the conclusion that "Ignatius is an outstanding illustration of the tortured, divided soul." The entire article deserves careful reading, but we quote a few sentences which stress the writer's principal conclusions. He says: "The type of mental ailment from which he [Loyola] suffered, can with a fair degree of accuracy be determined as a manic-depressive psychosis. He was subject to excessive mood swings. There were periods of profound depression with suicide impulses, followed by states of great exultation. . . . In the depressed phase, mental life is slowed down, and a few thoughts dominate the mind with compulsive insistence. At such times Ignatius went through periods of scrupulosity when he confessed the same trivial sins, often several times in a day. The feeling of complete unworthiness, of having forfeited every claim to the good will of God and man are all present in Ignatius. He speaks from experience when he describes 'the peculiarity of the evil spirit to cause remorse, to sadden and to place impediments, disquieting with false rumors.' . . . How could an individual as ill as Ignatius accomplish his mission? The answer lies in the nature of the disease. A manic-depressive patient retains a large degree of judgment and remains in continuous contact with his environment. There are long periods of recession when the patient is apparently normal apart from a heightened emotionality. In the manic phase he is filled with plans, schemes, ambitions, oblivious of any obstacles. Many of the missionary enterprises of Ignatius were probably begun at such times." It may be well for Catholic controversialists to examine some of their own leaders instead of criticizing Luther and his fellow writers and finding in them madmen and reprobates. The same issue of the *Quarterly* quotes from the *Christian Century* (October 17, 1945) that a textbook, *La Religion Explicada*, has been prepared by Father Ardizzone for the use of high school students in Argentina and that this has been approved by the Roman Catholic authorities there. The

book treats Luther and the other Protestant Reformers in terms like these: "Protestantism does not possess elements of a true church. It has no holiness. Luther, Calvin, Henry VIII, Theodore Beza, etc., were all men of infamous and scandalous conduct. . . . God never uses such corrupt people to fulfill the important mission of founding a religion. . . . Luther preferred to remain in the mud puddle of his licentious life. After he had drunk well and eaten to satiety and blasphemed without restraint, he died, gorged with food and wine, at the end of a banquet in 1546. Many historians affirm that he hanged himself, thus ending with suicide a life of sadness." The true facts concerning Luther's death are then presented by quoting a chapter of Rudolf Thiel's *Luther*, Vol. II (Berlin: Paul Neff Verlag, 1937), which makes excellent and timely reading.

J. T. M.

Baptist Inconsistency.—Some Baptist churches, as was pointed out in these columns some time ago, are considerably agitated over the fact that in a relatively large number of Baptist churches, primarily in the Northern Convention, people are admitted to open or associate membership without having been immersed. In an article, "The Trend Away from Immersion," the *Watchman-Examiner* of Feb. 28, 1946, calls attention to the dangers of this trend for Baptist principles. We read: "A Baptist church without clear and unmistakable conviction is a misnomer. Its very name carries with it uniqueness and challenge. When Baptist churches relax their Christian conviction, they impair their essential witness. The most thriving of our Baptist churches are those which adhere most firmly to the traditional Baptist belief. But that is not saying enough. Baptists have a duty to all other Christians. Theirs is the duty to witness to God's Word and to call people to obedience to its clear commands. By countenancing concessions and accepting on equal terms those who are living in open disobedience to our Lord's commands, whether knowingly or unknowingly, we fail first in our loyalty to the Word of God, then in Christian service to these people, then in our witness to the church at large and the world beyond. If Baptist churches have no specific witness or function, they have no right to exist. Baptists are not sectarian, in spite of insulting charges of this nature from certain sources. We are a witnessing people. We do not exist primarily to build hierarchies or ecclesiastical systems. We are here within Christendom, within hierarchical or denominational Christianity, as part of the mystical body of Christ on earth to affirm and to practice the verities of a pure faith and a God-ordained order. When we turn away from our distinctives, therefore, we fail and are destined to die out."

We appreciate the *Watchman-Examiner's* demand for an uncompromising witness to God's Word, but cannot understand that consistency does not compel the editor to demand an uncompromising attitude over against the whole counsel of God. We deplore that the call to confession is restricted to a distinctive

Baptist tenet which, after all, is an exegetical problem. If the Baptists in their insistence upon immersion denounce indiscriminate church fellowship with non-immersionists, how can fundamentalist Baptists fraternize with the modernistic Baptists?

F. E. M.

Some More Information on the World Council of Churches.— According to information from Geneva by R. N. S. the World Council of Churches will be launched at a meeting of the World Council to be held toward the end of August, 1948. The general subject of discussion will be "The Order of God and the Present Disorder of Man." Problems that will be given special attention are those of world order, evangelism, and similar matters. The number of delegates, it is expected, will be 450, representing the churches now belonging to the World Council and such as will join in the next two years. An invitation to seek membership will be sent the Orthodox churches. Bishop Theophil Wurm, who is the president of the council of the German Evangelical Church, was elected a member of the provisional committee of the World Council of Churches. His permanent alternate is Representative Martin Niemoeller, according to the secretary of the provisional council, Dr. Visser 'T Hooft. The aim is not to obtain as many members as possible. "On the contrary, the admission of a great number of very small unstable churches or sects would do more harm than good. Our attitude must not be that of a collector, but rather of a builder."

A commission was appointed which is to give its attention to international relations, its mandate being "to increase the churches' influence in world political affairs." Its purpose, so the announcement says, will be in particular "to stimulate the churches of all nations to a more vigorous expression of the demands of the Christian conscience to the political policies of governments." "Other objectives will be to study the question of world order and to make the results of such studies widely known; to organize conferences in which church leaders and laymen of different nations 'will find a Christian fellowship and reach a Christian judgment on world issues'; and to give expression to the spiritual principles 'which must determine contemporary political decisions.'" Among the members of the commission are found Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Mr. John Foster Dulles, and Bishop G. A. Oldham. Representatives of the former enemy countries will be included.

Another undertaking inaugurated by the provisional committee of the World Council of Churches is an ecumenical training center, which is to be established in Geneva. Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., presented a gift of one million dollars for this venture. He specified that half the sum should be spent on maintaining a laymen's training center on the continent sponsored by the World Council. According to present plans, the center will open the latter part of this year and will provide studies for young laymen

especially from European countries. Sixty regular students will take courses lasting from three to six months and will attend conferences in the summer of each year. Dr. Handrik Kraemer, who belongs to the Netherlands Reformed Church, was chosen as director of the center. He was formerly professor of history of religion in Leyden University. He is best known as missionary, having served with distinction in Oriental mission fields. At this writing it is not known whether he will accept.

We see that the men at the head of the World Council of Churches are extremely busy and active in promoting the ideals of their organization. What the observer misses is that the dispatches do not contain any evidence of the manifestation of earnest efforts to obtain full unity in the understanding of the Gospel message.

A.

Temperance Efforts to the Front.—In various ways the temperance forces of the country are becoming audible, according to R. N. S. The Methodist bishops, assembled in Atlantic City, N. J., urged that a united temperance organization representing all denominations be formed. This resolution was adopted. "It is the prayerful hope of the council of bishops that assemblies, conventions, and conferences of many church organizations will take steps to co-operate in a new movement which united Christian forces will support. We pledge our loyalty to such a program. When the churches join in the establishment of the United Temperance Organization, we believe existing temperance agencies will accept the new approach to the old problem for the new day." As was to be expected, it is proposed that a special Sunday, June 2, be set aside "as a day of prayer for the curtailment of the traffic in beverage alcohol." It will have to be seen whether the intention of the promoters of the temperance cause is to declare the use of alcoholic beverages anti-Biblical or whether the basis of the propaganda is the conviction that the enormous consumption of such beverages in our country is one of the social evils which our generation has to combat.

A.

United Brethren Approve Merger with Evangelical Church.—R. N. S. reports that in a recent vote taken by the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, the project of merging this denomination with the Evangelical Church (in many circles better known as Albright Brethren) was approved by 85 per cent of all the ballots cast. The board of bishops was authorized to call a special session of the General Conference. It has now been decided that this meeting shall take place in November of this year and that the place shall be Johnstown, Pa. At the same time and place the General Conference of the Evangelical Church will assemble, and there the merger will be consummated. The name of the new denomination is to be Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Legislation Pertaining to Divorces.—R. N. S. has gathered information on attempts made in the various legislatures of our country to deal with the divorce evil. In Georgia the legislature

enacted a bill which will make the obtaining of a divorce easier than it was in the past. While formerly nine to twelve months were required before a divorce could be granted, now fifty days are sufficient, and while formerly divorce cases had to be tried by jury, this provision now has been abrogated, unless the defendant should demand a jury trial. In the past the charge of desertion had to bring proof that the desertion had existed for three years if a divorce was to be granted on that ground. Now the time has been reduced to one year. Additional grounds for divorce incorporated in the present law are habitual intoxication and cruel treatment.

In other States, however, the trend has been in the very opposite direction. In the Massachusetts legislature a bill has been introduced which would limit divorce grounds to adultery and impotency. In the Kentucky legislature measures have been introduced which would provide "that no divorce decree would become effective for twelve months after being granted; which would bar cruel and inhuman treatment as a plea for divorce for three years after marriage; which would provide that a divorced person who was at fault could not marry again, except to the other party, until five years after the divorce was granted; and which would ban divorce on any grounds until couples have been married at least three years. A bill introduced in the Virginia legislature to make incurable insanity a ground for divorce was opposed by clergymen and superintendents of mental hospitals. It was argued that no one can say that insanity is incurable and that many seemingly hopeless cases recover.—R. N. S. adds this interesting note: "Whether divorces should be granted for insanity has been raised as an issue in the past in many other States. Insanity varying from two years up to ten years is now recognized as a ground for divorce in 28 States. Rhode Island's State Bar Association recently voted against adding insanity arising after marriage as a ground for obtaining divorce in that State. A special committee of the Association which studied the issue saw 'no justification for regarding mental illness of either party arising subsequent to the marriage as any different from any serious physical illness developing thereafter.'" The governor of Rhode Island, John O. Pastore, urges that more stringent divorce laws be adopted because "any attempt to weaken or destroy the family group strikes at the very foundation of governmental structure." In Detroit a judge declared: "Divorces in Detroit are almost on a production line basis. There has got to be some responsibility connected with getting married." South Carolina is said to be the only State in the nation without a divorce law, and its legislature has repeatedly rejected attempts to repeal its State constitutional prohibition against divorce on any grounds. New York State recognizes only adultery as a divorce ground. "In the other States, grounds in which divorces may be obtained and the time in which they can be obtained vary widely. This has resulted in considerable legal

confusion, particularly since the U. S. Supreme Court has refused in a number of recent cases to interfere with the ruling of State courts on the validity of divorce decrees. Uniform federal divorce regulations have been unsuccessfully proposed in Congress for more than three decades."

A.

Danger of Division in the Old Coptic Church. — From Cairo, Egypt, a correspondent of *R. N. S.* sends the following information: "The threatened split between the Coptic and Ethiopian churches has brought into focus a major crisis in the life of Egypt's oldest Christian body. A persecuted minority since the Arab conquest of the seventh century, the Coptic Church stands in danger of losing its control over the entire Ethiopian Church, as a result of differences arising from the election of the Coptic patriarch and the appointment of the Ethiopian metropolitan. The Ethiopians have demanded representation in the election of the patriarch and the appointment of an Ethiopian, instead of Egyptian, metropolitan for the Ethiopian Church. The first demand has been met, but not the second. Emperor Haile Selassie recently sent a commission to Cairo to discuss the problem, but the group has met with little success, and the split between the two churches seems almost certain. Such a division would mark the end of a relationship that can be traced back to 450 A. D., when Christianity became the religion of the Ethiopian Empire. During that century the Copts broke off from the Roman Church because of theological differences concerning the relation of the divine to the human nature of Christ."

Continuing, the correspondent points out that in a population of 17 million people in Egypt there are one million Copts. Once upon a time their religion was the ruling one. The majority of the people now are Mohammedans. The name "Copt" is a transliteration from the Greek for Egyptian. "When the Arabs invaded Egypt, the country was predominantly Christian, and the names 'Egyptian' and 'Christian' were used synonymously. One of the Coptic churches is said to be the oldest existing church in the world. It is known as the 'Crypt Church' of Old Cairo, and is said to have been built in the third century, or even earlier. The language of ancient Egypt is used in the ritual of the Coptic Church. Nowhere else is it still employed. Outside of the ritual the Copts use the Arabic language."

A.

Education with or without God. — This is the topic of a sermon preached by the Rev. Bastian Kruithof, minister of the First Reformed Church, Holland, Mich., on Nov. 4, 1945, and published in the *Calvin Forum* (March, 1946). The sermon, which is an appeal for Christian day schools, contains much valuable informative material and shows how the problem of religious education is troubling the minds of many earnest men and women today. Under the heading "Secularism in American Education" he quotes Dean Willard L. Sperry of the Harvard Divinity School as having said recently: "The generation of youth going to our schools and colleges in the last thirty or forty years, to all intents and purposes,

are religious illiterates. The English Bible is an almost unknown book. This religious illiteracy is the price paid for freedom of religion. Public schools and State universities, by virtue of our separation of Church and State, are prohibited from any but the most minimal religious practices and are denied the opportunity for anything like sober instruction in these matters, even as history and literature. Religious instruction in the home has become ineffective. The majority of parents do not know what to teach their children because they themselves do not know what they believe." He quotes also Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the *Christian Century*, who in an address before the Missouri State Teachers' Association several years ago said the following startling things: "I am bound to lay on the doorstep of our educational system the prime responsibility for the decline of religion and the steady advance of secularism in American society." "The time has come to break the taboo against religious instruction in the public schools." "It is just as much the function of public education to teach religion as to teach any other subject." He refers, moreover, to the Scottish theologian John Baillie, who in a lecture at Princeton last summer pleaded for Christian schools. "These men," he says, "are not crackpots. They see the tragic situation, lament it, and propose remedies." There are other important facts to note. "A questionnaire sent to 18,000 high school students revealed that 16,000 of them could not name three prophets of the Old Testament, 12,000 could not name the four Gospels, and 10,000 could not name three of the twelve Apostles." The writer regards it as an inadequate remedy simply to put the Bible into the public schools, for "that is quite useless unless the Bible is read. And the reading of the Bible is rather insignificant unless it is interpreted." He considers also the matter of "released time," but "in the background there always hovers the question: Is it legal? As long as there is no protest, the instruction goes on." But "released time has been banned in a section of New York State because of a protest by the Rochester Freethinkers Society. As a result hundreds of children are deprived of religious instruction." "But what is the cure?" asks the writer. "In England co-operation by churches and the National Union of Teachers has resulted in an outline for religious training in the schools." Also Finland has a distinctive religious program for its schools, as, of course, also other countries, such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark. Morrison, to mention only one, "wants teachers trained in religion to teach in all public schools." If that fails, then Morrison says: "If the inclusion of religion in the curriculum of public education cannot be worked out, I see for Protestantism only one conceivable alternative. I see nothing for the Protestant churches to do but to establish their own schools, somewhat on the model of the Roman Catholic parochial schools, and to withdraw their children from the public schools." Ultimately this is also Kruithof's solution, for he says: "Perhaps the best solution will prove to be a Christian

school sponsored not by one denomination for its own perpetuation but by several denominations agreed on the fundamentals of Christianity. Even such an institution might be called sectarian and un-American, but the charges would be as absurd as they are false." He adds: "We had better translate some of the zeal which America has for the Sunday school and some of the zeal, too, which few of us have for the Christian college into the channels of grade school and high school education. Without that our inconsistencies stand out, and our lamentations will continue." It is not necessary for us to add any comment to what Mr. Kruithof says in his article. But it shows that the problem of religious education is a most urgent one and that we can afford to ignore it neither as Christians nor as citizens interested in the welfare of our country.

J. T. M.

Brief Items. — On Sundays during Lent the reputed true crown of thorns with which Christ was tortured during His Passion will be shown to worshipers at Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris. This is the only time of the year when the relic may be seen. — R. N. S.

Pastor Niemoeller of Germany, so R. N. S. reports, uttered a sensible warning addressed to the Church in Germany which he represents. He urges it to stay out of politics. "We wish to avoid any new barriers between us and the workers, particularly at this time when there are signs of a rapprochement."

According to R. N. S. some present-day leaders in France are working for liberty of education in their country. A new constitution is being debated, and these leaders would like to see a paragraph incorporated which absolutely guarantees the freedom mentioned. "Leftist groups have not openly advocated abolition of church schools, but are solidly against subsidies for any but State schools."

A Russian edition of the full Bible will soon be ready for distribution in the Soviet, through limited channels, the Rev. Thomas T. Holloway, field secretary of the American Bible Society, told Southern Baptist editors in their annual meeting at Mobile, Ala. . . . From 25,000 to 50,000 copies will be run off in the initial printing. . . . No new Bibles in Russian have been printed since the late 1920's because of a ban on importation and distribution of the Scriptures imposed by the Communist government. — R. N. S.

A minister in Buffalo read the New Testament in the Revised Standard Version in seven hours and thirty-nine minutes. He stated that he desired to demonstrate to young people that the New Testament is not as long a book as they think.

In Canada Roman Catholic organizations are preparing to ask their government to establish diplomatic relations with the papal court and to appoint a Canadian ambassador to Rome. In support of this move it is stated by the promoters that forty different states already sustain such relations with the Roman see. — R. N. S.

The following eleven groups have been licensed by the President's War Relief Control Board to solicit and receive contributions for the sufferers in Central Europe: American Friends Service Committee, Brethren Service Committee, Christian Science War Relief Committee, Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction, Federal Council of Churches, International Rescue and Relief Committee, Inc., Labor League for Human Rights (A. F. of L.), Lutheran World Relief, Mennonite Central Committee, National CIO Community Service Committee, and the War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Discussing the Pope's recent action of appointing a number of new cardinals, the *Christian Century* quotes the Pope as defending his new course by insisting on "the need and significance of her [Rome's] vital law of continuous adaptation, which some, incapable of grasping such a magnificent concept, have interpreted or described as opportunism." Is Rome leaving behind the *semper idem* ideal?

According to an exchange the Baptist Church is the oldest Free Church in Sweden, having been established in 1848, and has 41,000 members. Twenty years later the Methodist Church was founded, and now has 12,000 members. Much larger than either is the Swedish Mission Union, founded in 1878, which has 106,000 members.

Eighty-two Italian priests and three nuns arrived in Brindisi from Albania, bringing news that all Italian Roman Catholic clergy have now been expelled from Albania under a decree issued by the new government.—R. N. S. for 3/4/46.

Postwar inflation is striking heavily at Hungary's Protestant churches, already severely handicapped by loss of revenue-producing properties under new laws nationalizing church-owned estates. Authorities report that Protestant church life is at its lowest ebb in centuries. . . . The Reformed Church, largest Protestant denomination in Hungary, now numbers only 1,800,000 in comparison with three million before the war. Second largest group are the Lutherans, whose following has dropped from 700,000 to 500,000. Excepting the Roman Catholic Church, these denominations were the hardest hit by agrarian reforms, since most of their schools and charitable institutions depended on the income received from landholdings.—R. N. S.

In Italy priests are not to engage in politics according to the constitution of the country. Communists complain of "increasing clericalism" in Italy. The Roman Catholic Bishop Benigna Migliorini states that his priests are "ready to obey God rather than man," and to defy chains and prison to save an almost entirely Catholic Italy." Cf. R. N. S. dispatch of February 28.

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

The Presence. By B. von Schenk. Ernst Kauffmann, Inc. 179 pages, $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$. \$2.00.

The history of doctrine shows us that in combating false theological trends or doctrinal errors the "theological pendulum" has frequently swung from one extreme to the opposite extreme. In their zeal for the truth theologians are sometimes prone to overstate their case and thereby lapse into an error themselves. Nic. Amsdorf detested George Major's Romanizing statement: "Good works are necessary to salvation," and fell into the opposite extreme: "Good works are detrimental to salvation." His intentions were undoubtedly good, but his statement is untenable. The author of *The Presence* is motivated by the noble purpose of making the Lord's Supper more meaningful to our people and of encouraging them to commune devotionally and frequently. Every Lutheran pastor has given earnest thought to this problem, and — judging by some recent monographs, e. g., H. T. Kerr, *The Christian Sacraments*; E. S. Freeman, *The Lord's Supper in Protestantism* — this is a problem which concerns also the pastors in the "non-sacramental" churches. Many pastors will be vitally interested in this publication. There is indeed much food for thought in this book. Pastor von Schenk presents his main thesis in an arresting manner and quickens in the reader a desire to partake of the Supper frequently for the strengthening of his faith. Unfortunately the author does not preserve the proper theological equilibrium. There are so many overstatements in the book that the Lutheran reader is at times bewildered and confused and at other times in complete disagreement with the author.

1. The author prompted the reviewer to ask himself: Has my teaching of the Lord's Supper been so intellectual and dogmatic that I have failed to stress properly the spiritual blessings and to develop a truly devotional attitude in my hearers? The author intimates that the emphasis on the right doctrinal formula in the controversies with Romanists and Calvinists has overshadowed the real purpose of Communion. If that has been the case, then the remedy certainly does not lie in a submergence of the doctrinal side. The "theological pendulum" dare not swing to the other extreme and prompt us to say: "There have been controversies as to the exact nature of the Presence of our Lord and of His Body and Blood, but the fact which matters most is that He comes, not the way in which He comes" (p. 31; cp. 26—27). When during the Crypto-Calvinistic controversy the doctrine of the true Presence was denied by some Lutherans, Melanchthon brushed the doctrinal consideration aside with the statement: "Melius est corpus Christi in mentem tuam quam in ventrem tuum ire." The blurb recommends the book with the statement that the author "approaches the Holy Sacrament less from the intellectual and dogmatic side than from the devotional side." In our opinion this is a censure rather than an encomium, for while it is of course not sufficient "to think in terms of well-known doctrinal definitions" (11), no one can

derive the God-intended blessings if he relies on his emotions, experience, and devotion. We must apprehend the divine blessings, first "intellectually," we must first know doctrinally what God offers, before we can partake of these blessings "emotionally." Let us beware of a false mysticism. The pendulum can so easily swing in that direction.

2. All doctrines must center about the great redemptive work of Christ and our appropriation of the same. This implies that the preacher and teacher must give each doctrine its proper emphasis in relation to the central doctrine of our faith. Do we always maintain this proper balance? Do we present the whole counsel of God? Have we given the emphasis to the Lord's Supper which the Savior intended? The author believes that "the chief cause of this decline [of spirituality] is the neglect of the Blessed Sacrament and this neglect has been almost universal" (25). His endeavor to extol the blessings of the Lord's Supper is laudable. Unfortunately his method, if seriously followed, results in an eccentric theology. In his book he presents the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the New Obedience, the Church, and even Heaven as though God had focused the great truths of the Bible "at the Altar," where we can perceive them with our senses and physically realize them. The *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* is "the Altar." "Bethlehem comes to us in the Sacrament of Holy Communion. At the altar you find Bethlehem" (49). "The Holy Communion is the continuation of the Incarnation" (43). "At the Altar we link ourselves with the saints. Here we are caught up with them" (127). "The Altar is the trysting place where we meet our [departed] loved ones" (131). "In Holy Communion we have the basis for true Church unity and union" (156). The author holds that according to Luther living comes first and doctrines concerning it come second, and therefore he says that "at the Altar the believer is in fellowship with the Lord . . . and with all Christians who kneel at Christian Altars. . . . By receiving His Body from above we are to become His Body on earth. In the Holy Communion we have the basis for true Church unity and union. It transcends all denominational lines" (156, f.). "The Word preached is mingled with human imperfections, whereas that which is received in the Sacrament is wholly Divine. Therefore the Church must gather all her energies of faith and love, all her resources of splendor and devotion round the Divine Mystery of the Altar. The Most Blessed Presence under the forms of Bread and Wine is the sun and center, the heart and soul, of the worship to which she invites her children" (159). While these are not the author's own words they are quoted without comment by him. The theology presented in *The Presence* is an *ex parte* theology and therefore inadequate and not genuinely Lutheran as presented in Luther's monumental writings on the Lord's Supper and in the Formula of Concord.

3. What is the purpose of partaking of Holy Communion: strengthening of our faith in the forgiveness of sin or of our new spiritual life? The two go hand in hand. But have we probably so emphasized the former that we neglected the latter? The author's purpose is to show that there is a "connection between the victorious life and the Blessed Sacrament." And He brings

this truth home in a very striking manner. But the author loses himself so completely in this one theme that the first purpose of the Lord's Supper is almost entirely neglected. One would expect to find a clear-cut presentation of the vicarious atonement in a treatise on the Lord's Supper, especially in Part Two, where Calvary is discussed. But he does not say much more than the following brief paragraph: "In order that justice could be done, Love had to give itself. What happened? A little baby was born in Bethlehem. Thirty-three years later the man Jesus hangs on the Cross. Thus Justice and Love met and kissed" (60). In his zeal to make the Lord's Supper meaningful for sanctification, he goes to extremes. "He who gave Himself for me on the Cross is giving Himself to me as I come to the Altar. Then He gave Himself unto death. Now He gives Himself to me for life" (12). Indeed, Christ must dwell in us. But the author puts the "Christ in us" so to the fore, in fact, speaks of it as the at-one-ment, that the "Christ for us" is hard to find. He speaks in glowing terms of the mystical union (61), but there can be no union of man with God unless there is first a union of God with man through faith in Christ, who died for us, the *Christus extra nos et pro nobis*.

4. On one question in particular the "theological pendulum" has been swinging from one extreme to the other, and that is: How does the transcendent God reveal Himself to man? No man has seen God at any time, but in Christ Jesus He has revealed Himself to us, and we find God in the Word. This does not seem to be sufficient for some Roman and Anglican Catholics. Distinguishing sharply between body and soul, they believe that God's revelation to man must be in some tangible form. The author apparently has read a great deal in Roman and Anglican literature — at least he quotes extensively from these sources. And this influence is evident. "Our body is the only vehicle by which our spirit can work. God gives us the spiritual enshrined in the material. . . . It is because of this that the Christmas story is so meaningful. Bethlehem is brought down today at the Altar" (50). "We ask our catechumens where God is. They reply: 'Where the Word is.' How true. But is He not in some special place? Yes, at the Altar, for Christ says: 'This is My body'" (51). "God always focused Himself to a place. He had to do that because people are what they are" (86). God has promised His gracious presence in His Word (Romans 10), and we have no assurance that He is closer to us "at the Altar," where "the infinite is shrined in the finite, Heaven stoops down to earth, and the seen and the unseen meet" (132). This Romanticist principle is basic throughout the book and unfortunately mars some fine sections and distorts others entirely. The terminology employed in describing the Real Presence can be understood only in the sense of an impanation or a physical presence of Christ in the sacramental elements. "Then wrapped in Mary's arms, now wrapped in bread and wine" (53). Throughout the impression is created that our souls require something physical and tangible for a true worship and for true sanctification. "The Communion is a drama which exhibits the Mystery of Redemption more than any doctrinal teaching has ever been able to do" (15). It is not clear whether the author believes in the sacramental mode of eating and drinking or whether he has in mind a physical or metaphysical eating and drinking. "Christ

ought to be spiritually enfleshed in the heart of every man" (16). The author's view that the invisible must be made tangible for us explains his view that the Sacrament can effect changes in the life of Christians which the Word cannot do so effectively. While he does not want to separate Word and Sacrament, he believes that the Sacrament is the climax of the worship (140—141). Does he mean that in the Sacrament the Word read in the Bible or spoken in the sermon is personalized and individualized? Then why state: "The Blessed Sacrament is the full means of grace"? (145.) Then why promise that the panacea of the Church's ills is found in a regular, weekly, even daily Communion? (146 f.) A thorough study of the Lord's Supper from the doctrinal as well as from the devotional side is not only a *desideratum* but a *necessarium*. The present treatise does not solve the problem. **F. E. MAYER**

The Infallible Word. A Symposium by the Members of the Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary. The Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Co., 1505 Race St., Philadelphia 2, Pa. 300 pages (including index), $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.50.

This fine and timely book, splendid in content and mechanical make-up, was written by the Westminster (Dr. Machen) Faculty to defend the Westminster Confession, ratified 300 years ago, which declares the Bible to be "given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life," and is directed chiefly against Neo-Barthianism, which denies the very fact that Holy Scripture is the infallible Word of God, given by inspiration, and as such the sole source and rule of faith. On the whole, Westminster's seven professors have done wisely and well, and their apologetic is worthy of the deep learning and sincere piety of their forefathers, who against Romanism defended the divine infallibility of the Holy Scriptures. The book contains seven treatises: "The Attestation of Scripture" (Murray); "The Authority of the Old Testament" (Young); "The Authority of the New Testament" (Stonehouse); "The Transmission of the Scriptures" (Skilton); "The Relevancy of Scripture" (Woolley); "Scriptural Preaching" (Kuiper); "Nature and Scripture" (Van Til). The reviewer believes this one of the best books written in defense of the Christian doctrine of Scripture in recent times, and he recommends it cordially to his fellow ministers for careful study. Perhaps Dr. Van Til's chapter on "Nature and Scripture" will give the reader some trouble, for it endeavors to demonstrate that natural theology (as originally given to Adam) is fully in agreement with and demanded the revealed theology which was imparted to man after the Fall, while dialectical theology fits in well with the natural (perverse) theology of the Aristotle-Thomas Aquinas-Kant tradition, so that with Aristotle, Aquinas, and Kant we must reject also the theology of Reinhold Niebuhr, Richard Kroner, Paul Tillich, Nels Ferré, and John Mackay. Not always could the reviewer agree with the learned writer, but the final result of his research is certainly true. The "natural theology" of ancient and modern rationalism is not the true natural theology which God inscribed into man's heart and which, though obscured, still is true so far as it goes. Rationalism rather represents a perversion of that true natural theology. All the authors are frank and convinced Calvinists, and therefore every now and then the Lutheran

reader will find occasion for dissent. But the fundamentals of Scripture, defended in this excellent book, are ecumenically Christian, and for this reason the book deserves the widest possible dissemination, since today the thesis which it champions is so widely and vehemently attacked by the opponents of the Christian faith.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

The Fulness of God. An Exposition of Ephesians from the Greek.
By John H. Cable, Member of the Faculty, Moody Bible Institute. Moody Press, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill. 160 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$. \$1.50.

Based on the Greek text and attempting to make the words of Ephesians more meaningful by frequent references to the original, this commentary, simple, brief, and unpretentious though it is, deserves a welcome. The author came to Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, from the Missionary Training Institute at Nyack, N. Y. Besides teaching he often fills appointments as visiting preacher. A reverent student of the Bible, he endeavors constantly to interpret Scripture by Scripture — certainly the best method that can be conceived of. He does not engage in long excususes or any very detailed discussion of controverted points. His aim is to draw attention to the great ideas of the Apostle and to set them forth on the basis of simple word studies. Illustrations and apt anecdotes are used liberally to drive home the important truths that are expressed in the Epistle.

Matters of technical scholarship are treated very briefly, if at all. The question whether Ephesians is a circular letter or whether it was originally meant for the Christians of one city (Ephesus) is disposed of in these few words (p. 15): "The fact that 'at Ephesus,' *en Epheso*, is omitted in some important Greek manuscripts causes us to think of this book as a circulatory letter suited to any Christian Church. Hence its teaching is more universally applicable. It challenges the devotion and fidelity of all. Its provisions and promises are for all. Its standards of conduct apply to all." The work does not pretend to be a scientific commentary. It can render service to the preacher or teacher who is looking for some stimulating comments on a text from Ephesians, often called the most profound Epistle of the New Testament.

W. ARNDT

The Significance of Silence and Other Sermons. By Dr. Leslie D. Weatherhead. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York. 238 pages, $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. \$2.00.

The author of this book, Dr. Leslie D. Weatherhead, is heralded as a "great British preacher." If his greatness is to be judged by this book, it is not that of a great Christian preacher. He takes a wrong view of the Bible. He says: "The Bible begins with a beautiful legend about the beginning of things. The whole legend is summarized in the first four words: 'In the beginning God. . . .' In that lovely legend of the Creation the editor of Genesis is not trying to write a book of science. If he is still in heaven and takes interest about the things of earth, he must often have laughed at the wrangles of our great-grandfathers as to whether every word was literally and scientifically true. He wasn't interested in science. The word meant nothing to him. He was writing that lovely

parable to say that every beautiful thing we find on earth comes to us from God" (p. 129). Speaking of the writers of the Bible, he says: "So we find incorporated their prejudices, their beliefs, their background of cosmology and astronomy and philosophy" (p. 128). Again he says: "After all, just because the Gospels are human documents, we may expect that in details there will be matters which we shall never be asked to take as evidence of divine inspiration" (135). Although the author treats such subjects as "Why Should I Read the Bible?" "Youth Looking to Christ," and "A Message to the Spiritually Discouraged," one looks in vain for a clear statement of the Atonement. The author has given us a very disappointing book.

J. H. C. FRITZ

These Live On. By Clyde H. Denis. Good Books, Inc., Chicago. 204 pages. 1945. \$2.00.

The title of this book is somewhat misleading. It would have us believe that the characters portrayed "live on" through the miraculous intervention of God in times of danger, while the wish of the author is that these stories might be preserved and "live on."

The book itself is a compilation, the various stories being written by different authors, often in the words of the characters themselves. As a consequence, the stories vary greatly in style and interest. Most of them are of the nature of testimonials, showing the mysterious power and presence of God in strengthening the faith of His children in times of danger and in miraculous conversions. While most of them reflect a deep, and sometimes touching, religious experience, a few smack more than a little of "foxhole" religion, a vague belief in the "Man Upstairs." Quite a few of the stories afford excellent material for sermon illustrations, e. g., "I Saw My Buddy Die," on p. 45, as an excellent illustration of the Atonement.

L. J. SNECK

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Minister Teaches Religion. By Frank A. Lindhorst. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York. 125 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$1.00.

He Is Able. By Chaplain Alvin O. Carlson. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 82 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. \$1.00.

The Sign That Saves. By Alvin O. Carlson, Pastor, Chaplain, Conference Evangelist. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 41 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. 35 cents.

From The Warner Press, Anderson, Ind.:

Bible Quiz Program Book. By Vivian Ahrendt. 156 pages, $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$. \$1.50.

From William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.:

The Shadow of Coming Events. By Dr. Harry Rimmer. 294 pages, $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. \$2.00.

Bible Questions Explained. By Louis T. Talbot, D.D. 280 pages, $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. \$2.00.